

THE
ACT OF BAPTISM

265.1
J77

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

in honor of

MISS FERN ROLD

presented by

Mrs. Esther Stofferson

Harlan, Iowa

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

Score

57

THE ACT OF BAPTISM.

THE
ACT OF BAPTISM:

A
CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL INQUIRY

CONCERNING
THE PROPER ADMINISTRATION OF THE RITE.

BY
REV. HUGH JONES, D.D.,

President of Llangollen College.

REPRINTED FROM *THE BAPTIST*.

LONDON:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
1876.

265.1
J77

P R E F A C E .

THE following chapters first appeared in THE BAPTIST, during the years 1873-1876. Several of the readers of that journal, in England and Wales, expressed a desire to have the articles published in a separate and more permanent form. In compliance with that request, they are now offered to the public.

The sole object of the Author in writing them was to elucidate the truth ; let it be the only aim of the reader to learn what is the Lord's will in regard to the ordinance of Baptism. "The meek will He guide in judgment : and the meek will He teach His way" (Psalm xxv. 9).

HUGH JONES.

*Llangollen,
November, 1876.*

29240

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

The Divine Origin of Baptism	...	...	...	...	PAGE 1
------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----------

CHAPTER II.

Preliminary Observations on the Act of Baptism	...	7
--	-----	---

CHAPTER III.

<i>Bapto</i> in Profane and Sacred Writings	...	...	...	12
---	-----	-----	-----	----

CHAPTER IV.

<i>Baptizo</i> in Greek Writings	...	...	...	...	18
----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

CHAPTER V.

Jewish Ablutions	...	...	...	...	...	24
------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

CHAPTER VI.

<i>Baptizo</i> in the New Testament	...	...	...	...	30
-------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

CHAPTER VII.

Baptism in the Primitive Church	...	...	...	...	37
---------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

CHAPTER VIII.

The Rise of Pouring or Sprinkling	...	...	...	42
-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	----

CHAPTER IX.

The Ancient Baptisteries	...	...	...	...	...	46
--------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

CHAPTER X.

Baptism in the Greek and Oriental Churches ...	...	PAGE 50
--	-----	------------

CHAPTER XI.

Objections—A Brief Review of Dr. Halley's Work on Baptism	...	56
---	-----	----

CHAPTER XII.

Objections by Dr. Halley and others ...	...	63
---	-----	----

CHAPTER XIII.

Baptism and Purification	...	71
---------------------------------	-----	----

CHAPTER XIV.

The Syriac Word for Baptism	...	75
------------------------------------	-----	----

THE ACT OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF BAPTISM.

“The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men?”—Matt. xxi. 25.

No candid reader of the New Testament can look at the ordinance of baptism with indifference. It is very frequently alluded to in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles. The Apostles preached it as a duty; the early converts submitted to it as a Divine institution, and a symbolical emblem of their renunciation of their ungodly life and of their assumption of the new life; it was honoured by the submission of the Lord Jesus Himself, and the descent of the Spirit, and the approval of the Father on the occasion of His baptism. In the apostolic churches there was but one baptism—one in its mode, subjects, and design; now two kinds of baptism obtain—the immersion of believers and the sprinkling of infants. Both cannot be right; one must be an error; and the sooner the better for that error to be discovered and renounced, as what is dishonouring to Christ and injurious to man.

The conflicting practices of Christians bewilder the inquirer; and the ambiguity in the authorized translation of the Bible sometimes confuses the reader in regard to the act of baptism. In that he finds the Greek preposition *en—in*—translated by *with* (John i. 33), when used with the verb *to baptize*; and verbs that are essentially different

translated by the same English expression *to wash*:—"He that is washed (*ho leloumenos*—he that has bathed) needeth not, save to wash (*nipsasthai*) his feet" (John xiii. 10); "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash (*nipsontai*) their hands oft, eat not. And when they come from the market, except they wash (*baptisontai*—except they immerse themselves), they eat not" (Mark vii. 3, 4). In the authorized rendering, the meaning of the above passages is obscured; while to the first readers of the Gospels it was clear, and the different acts were expressly described.

As baptism is a Christian ordinance, it must be borne in mind that the New Testament is the proper and ultimate standard of appeal in regard to it: all our views of it ought to be modified and regulated by this infallible law of the new covenant.

The first question that concerns us is—*Whether baptism be a Divine ordinance or not.* According to several authors it originated with men. The Jews practised it (they say) in admitting proselytes, and John and Christ adopted it from them. Drs. Hammond, Lightfoot, and Wall, and others after them, affirm that baptism had been long in use before the coming of Christ; that in admitting proselytes into their community the Jews baptized them, men, women, and children; that John and Christ adopted this ceremony, as it was in general use among them; and that, therefore, there was no need for any command to baptize infants, as all knew that infants were always baptized together with their parents; and that the fact that baptism is referred to in the Gospels as an institution that was well known, pre-supposes the existence of proselyte baptism before Christ.

The reader will observe that the above writers, in writing as they do, acknowledge that there is neither command to baptize infants, nor example of any such baptism in the New Testament; they do not plead Scriptural authority for it, as indeed there is none. It is assumed that Christ, in His conversation with Nicodemus, referred to Jewish proselyte baptism when He said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5); but Nicodemus might have learnt the nature of the new birth from the Old Testament—*e.g.*, Ps. li. 10, 11; Ezekiel xviii. 30, 31; xxxvi. 26, 27; Jeremiah xxxi. 33, 34; and from the preaching of John, Matt. iii. 8, 9. And it is

much more reasonable to suppose that Christ referred to John's baptism when He spoke of being born of water than to Jewish proselyte baptism, of which the Bible is silent. Nicodemus, therefore, as a master in Israel, ought to have been acquainted with the doctrine of the new birth, since it had been taught in the Old Testament, and was preached by John the Baptist. As to baptism being referred to as a well-known custom, it ought to be remembered that the Gospels were written long after the transactions recorded in them had taken place, when the history of John and Christ was well known to the churches, and when baptism was being frequently administered in the various provinces of the Roman Empire.

But let us see *what evidence there is to prove the assumed antiquity of Jewish proselyte baptism.*

1. *There is no mention of it in the Old Testament.*

The Old Testament refers to several who are supposed to have been proselytes, such as Jethro (Exod. xviii. 6), Rahab (Joshua vi. 25), Ruth (Ruth i. 16), and many Jews in the days of Esther (Esther viii. 17), but not a word is said of their baptism. The same law was for the sojourner in the land as for the Israelite in regard to eating the passover (Exod. xii. 48, 49), and no other preparation was to be exacted.

2. *There is no allusion to it in the Apocrypha.*

The books of the Apocrypha were probably written in the interval between the Old and New Testaments; they refer to Gentiles becoming proselytes to the Jewish religion (Judith xiv. 6), but not a word is said of the baptism of such.

3. *It is not mentioned in the New Testament.*

From the words of Christ, that the Pharisees "compassed sea and land to make *one* proselyte" (Matt. xxiii. 15), it would seem that cases of proselytism were not of frequent occurrence; but in the references made to proselytes, there is nothing whatever said of their being baptized (Acts ii. 10; vi. 5; xiii. 43).

4. *It is not referred to in Jewish writers of the Apostolic age.*

Philo of Alexandria, who flourished about the middle of the first century, though he wrote of proselytes and of the manner of their reception into the Jewish community, makes no mention of their baptism. Josephus, who was born at

Jerusalem, A.D. 87, refers to many proselytes to the Jewish religion. He says that the Idumeans in the time of Hyrcanus, B.C. 130, in order to retain their country in their own possession, became Jews, and submitted to circumcision (*Antiq. Book xiii., chap. ix. 1*). He speaks also of Izates, King of Adiabene (a district of Assyria east of the Tigris), in the time of Claudius Cæsar, and of others, embracing the Jewish religion, but he omits making any reference to their baptism (*Antiq. Book xx. chap. ii. 3, 4*).

5. *There is no reference to it in the Jewish Mishna.*

This is a collection of all the Jewish traditions, which had been handed down from one age to the other, and was written about the middle of the second century or the beginning of the third, to preserve the traditions from being lost.

6. *There is no allusion to it in the Christian Fathers for the first four centuries.*

Barnabas was a Jew and contemporary with the Apostles, and wrote of Jewish rites and their typical character, but he said nothing of Jewish proselyte baptism. Justin Martyr was a native of Samaria, and flourished in the middle of the second century, but though he disputed with Trypho the Jew, concerning Christianity and Judaism, yet he does not speak of the baptism of proselytes as an initiatory ordinance.

There is, in fact, no reference to Jewish proselyte baptism in any writer, either Jewish or Christian, earlier than the fourth or fifth century. It is the Jerusalem Talmud, written according to some in the third century, but more probably in the beginning of the fifth, that first refers to the ceremony. It is frequently referred to also in the Babylonian Talmud, written according to some about A.D. 500, but according to others about the beginning of the seventh century.

The reader, by this time, is ready to ask, How could this rite have existed before Christ, when there is no reference whatever to its existence for at least three or four hundred years after His coming? It is much more likely that the Jews should have adopted their custom from John, as Dr. Owen suggests; or from the Christians, as Dr. Jennings intimates; or that they instituted it as a symbol of purification on account of their notions of the general uncleanness of the heathen, as Dr. Gill thinks, than that John should have derived his baptism from them.

But there are insuperable objections to the theory that

John and Christ adopted proselyte baptism to be the initiatory rite into the kingdom of God :—

1. The silence of the Bible is fatal to such a theory.

2. Jewish proselyte baptism and the baptism of the New Testament are essentially different.

As far as immersion is concerned, proselyte baptism confirms that mode, and condemns the contrary one, for it was to be administered in a river, well, or pool, containing at least forty *seahs* (or about sixty gallons) of water, in which the whole body was to be immersed. But there was an essential difference between proselyte baptism and the baptism taught in the New Testament :—

(1.) Proselytes and their children were baptized when first admitted into the Jewish community ; but the children that were afterwards born to them were not baptized, nor any of their posterity ; it was a maxim with the Rabbis, *Natus baptizati habetur pro baptizato*—"He that is born of a baptized parent is accounted as baptized"; but John's baptism was a baptism of repentance, and connected with personal religion.

(2.) Jewish proselyte baptism was more of a civil than a religious ceremony. It was a kind of naturalization—of investing a Gentile with the rights and privileges of a Jew. It was not administered in the name of God, nor in the name of the promised Messiah, but in the name of the person himself, by the authority of the Jewish Council ; but John and the Apostles baptized in the name of the Divine Persons, and by the authority of God.

(3.) Jewish proselytes immersed themselves, but Christian baptism is to be administered by another, to signify, perhaps, as Dr. Toy suggests, that the new life is bestowed and imparted by God.

3. The Bible declares that the baptism of John was from heaven. The evangelists testify that God had sent John to preach repentance and to baptize in water, and John affirms the same thing of himself (Mark i. 2 ; Luke iii. 2 ; John i. 6, 33) ; hence his baptism is called "the counsel of God" (Luke vii. 29, 30). If John adopted his baptism from the Jews, the evangelists mislead us ; in that case what difficulty would the Jews have to reply to the question "Whence was his baptism?" and how are we to account for the popularity of John and the attention paid to his baptism, if it was an old Jewish and human ordinance ? Is it likely that the Son of God Himself

would have honoured the ordinance by submitting to it, if it were but the tradition of man? Is not such a notion derogatory to the honour of the King of Zion, and contradictory to the express testimony of the New Testament?

Baptism, therefore, is a divine ordinance; it was God that sent John to baptize; baptism and the preaching of the Gospel were re-enacted by the commission of the Lord Jesus to His Apostles; that commission is to be in force to the end of the world, and it is the privilege as well as the duty of every believer to submit to Christ's authority in the ordinance under consideration.

The reader who wishes to prosecute the inquiry concerning Jewish proselyte baptism may consult Dr. Jennings' "Jewish Antiquities;" Moses Stuart on the "Mode of Baptism" (*American Bibl. Repository*, April, 1833); the exhaustive Dissertation of Dr. Gill; and an elaborate article in the *American Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1872, by the Rev. Dr. Toy, Greenville, S.C.

CHAPTER II.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS ON THE ACT OF BAPTISM.

THE LORD has clothed His thoughts in human language, and the way to find out what is the mind of God is to ascertain what is the meaning of the language in which it is conveyed to us. It may assist us in our present investigation, if we bear the following considerations in mind :—

1. *That Baptism is a positive command.*

The Bible contains moral and positive commands. Moral commands are good in themselves; what they inculcate would have been binding upon men, even if it had never been commanded; as a rule, they are to be obeyed in preference to positive commands when they clash (Matt. ix. 13; xii. 1—13), though in special cases, moral commands had to give way to positive ones (compare Gen. iv. 11, 12, ix. 4—6, with Gen. xxii. 1, 2, and Exod. xx. 13 with Joshua vi. 21). Moral commands may be complied with in several ways; it is possible to esteem one's parents and love one's neighbour in more ways than one. Positive commands, on the other hand, are good, *because they are commanded*. The reason for them may not be apparent to us, but it is our duty, nevertheless, to submit unto them, knowing that God is too wise to err, and too gracious to mislead us. There is but one way to observe a positive command, the slightest deviation from the letter renders man's obedience to these void. (Gen. ii. 16, 17; Exod. xx. 25; Gen. xix. 17—26; Numbers xx. 8—12; Lev. x. 1.)

Baptism is a positive command; it would not have been binding upon us had not God instituted it; it must be submitted to according to the command, or else God is not hon-

oured by our service ; if sprinkling be right, immersion must necessarily be prohibited ; if immersion be the right mode, sprinkling must be contrary to the command of Christ. To say that both modes are right and admissible, is contrary to the nature of all positive commands, and as absurd as to say that light and darkness are the same thing.

2. *That Baptizo expresses a specific act.*

It is not a generic term denoting *to wash* in any manner, but a word denoting a specific act, to immerse, to plunge, or to cause to be immersed or overwhelmed. The Greek is a copious language, abounding in terms that express the most delicate shades of meaning, *e.g.*,

LOUO—to wash one's person, to bathe.

PLUNO—to wash garments.

NIPTO—to wash the hands, the feet, or the face ; to wash some part of the person, as distinguished from *louo*.

EK-CHEO—to pour out, to shed.

BALLO—to throw, to thrust, to pour.

BRECHO—to wet, to moisten, to rain.

RAINO—to sprinkle, to besprinkle, to strew.

RANTIZO—to sprinkle, to besprinkle.

DUNO—to sink, go down.

KATADUO—to go down, sink, set ; to go down into, plunge into.

KATAKLUSO—to lave, inundate, deluge.

KATAPONTIZO—to throw into the sea, to plunge or drown therein.

KATAPINO—to gulp or swallow down, to swallow up.

These and other terms, which might be added, show that the Apostles had no need to use *baptizo* if they meant to teach sprinkling, pouring or washing, or purifying ; for there were other words which would have denoted these different acts with precision, whereas no other word would have expressed the act of immersing more clearly and expressly than *Baptizo*. The venerable Dr. Hodge intimates in his "Systematic Theology" (vol. iii. p. 536) that if *kataduo* had been used, there could be no dispute about the meaning of the ordinance. We venture to affirm that Christ has not spoken to us of this ordinance in an ambiguous manner, and that His meaning is as clear as if it had been expressed by *kataduo* ; indeed, we find Gregory Thaumaturgus (a Greek Father) in the third century, using *kataduo* as equivalent to

baptizo, by representing John as saying to Christ, "Plunge (*kataduson*) me into the stream of Jordan"; and Cyril, another Greek Father, and Bishop of Jerusalem in the fourth century, saying that the candidates sank down (*kateduete*), and arose again (*aneduete*) in their baptism. The Greeks always taught that there were a sinking down (*katadusis*) and a rising up (*anadusis*) in baptism. (See Professor Masson's note in "Winer's Grammar of the N. T. Diction," p. 400.) We shall have occasion again to refer to the testimony of the Greek Fathers.

If *baptizo* meant all that modern Pædobaptist writers attribute to it, it would require an inspired man to point out when and where it has this or that meaning, or else the reader would be left in endless confusion, and the Bible itself would be to him an inexplicable riddle.

3. *That several words retain their original meaning though appropriated to a religious use.*

It is said that words are not used in the Bible in the same sense as in classical authors. The words *God*, *heaven*, *flesh*, *faith*, and *righteousness*, are referred to as instances, Professor Stuart says that classical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament. On account of this, some writers declare that although the word *baptizo* in the classics means *to immerse*, it is used in the New Testament to denote *to purify* or *cleanse*, without any reference to the mode. In reply to this reasoning, we say that though there are some words used in the New Testament in a different sense from that in which they occur in the classics, yet all words are not so used. The words *to walk*, *to stand*, *to sleep*, *to eat*, *to drink*, though they may be figuratively used, occur in the same senses in both sacred and profane writings. *Many words retain their literal significations though appropriated to new uses*, as the following examples prove:—The Greek word *kerusso* means *to make proclamation as a herald*. It means the same when applied to the proclamation of the Gospel. The Greek words *esthio* and *pino* mean respectively *to eat* and *to drink*. They retain their literal meanings when used to describe the Lord's Supper. The Hebrew verb *zabach* means *to kill animals* (Deut. xii. 15). The word retains the same meaning of *to kill* when used for sacrificing to the Lord. The Greek words *pascho* and *apothnesko* mean respectively *to suffer* and *to die*. They do not lose these signi-

fications when used of the sufferings and death of Christ, though they took place in order to atone for our sins. Thus also in regard to *baptizo*. Its literal meaning is *to immerse*. It denotes exactly the same act when used of Christian baptism.

It is altogether a false way of interpreting the Bible, and an unwarrantable liberty with it, to say that because some words are not used in the same senses in the classics as in the New Testament, therefore *baptizo* cannot mean immersion. It would be as logical to say because *Theos* (God) does not mean the same being in the classics as in the Bible, therefore *anthropos* (man) does not denote the same being in profane writings as in the New Testament! The context, parallel passages, and the nature of the case are to be studied in order to ascertain the import of terms under consideration.

4. *That the testimony of lexicons, though important, is not the highest authority.*

The testimony of lexicons in general is of great importance, as embodying the results of the investigations of men of the highest culture, of immense reading, and of great critical ability, who have laid the world under lasting obligation to them. We adduce the testimony of a few of them, which may be taken as a specimen of what all reliable lexicons affirm:—

W. GREENFIELD'S "GREEK LEXICON."—"Baptizo.—To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; in the New Testament to wash, perform ablution, cleanse (Mark vii. 4, Luke xi. 38); to immerse, baptize, administer the rite of baptism (Mark i. 4, et al.); *with the accessory idea of obligation imposed*, to bind to the performance of some duty, to impose obligation by baptism (Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16; John iv. 1, et al.); *pass.* to receive the rite of baptism, to be baptized (Mark xvi. 16); *seq. eis*, to be baptized to *anyone*, to bind oneself to honour, obey, and follow anyone (Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. x. 2; Gal. iii. 27); *seq. eis to onoma tinos* (Acts xix. 5), &c.; *met.* to overwhelm *one with anything*, to bestow liberally, to imbue largely (Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16); *pass.* to be immersed in, or overwhelmed with miseries, oppressed with calamities (Matt. xx. 22, 23; Mark x. 38, 39; Luke xii. 50): whence *Baptisma*, what is immersed, hence immersion, baptism, ordinance of baptism."

LIDDELL AND SCOTT'S "GREEK LEXICON."—"Baptizo.—To dip under; of ships, to sink them Polyb. 2, 51, 6, etc. *ebaptisan ten polin*, metaph. of the crowds who flocked into Jerusalem at the time of the siege, Joseph. B. J.—Pass. to bathe, Eubul. Nausik. I: *hoi bebaptismenoi*, soaked in wine, Lat. *vino madidi*, Plat. Symp. 176, B.; *ophlemasi beb.* over head and ears in debt. Plut. Galb. 21, &c. II. To draw water, Plut. Alex. 67. cf. *bapto*. III. To baptize, N.T."

The testimony of Parkhurst, Dr. Ed. Robinson, and Thomas Sheldon Green is the same as that given by William Greenfield; while that of Dr. John Jones, Donnegan, Schrevelius, &c., is substantially the same as Liddell and Scott's. Let it be borne in mind that this is the testimony of Pædobaptists, and it shows—1. That they give to *immerse* or *dip* as the primary meaning of *baptizo*. 2. That none of them gives to *sprinkle* as one of its meanings. 3. That the reason for giving to *wash* or *cleanse* as one of its meanings is Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, where it means to bathe or immerse oneself, as we shall have occasion to show. 4. That they explain the figurative meaning of the word in the light of its literal meaning—to immerse or overwhelm.

The testimony of lexicons, however, is not infallible. Some portions of it seem to be biased by the theological opinions of the authors. Thus Dr. Robinson, after conceding as a scholar that *baptizo* means to dip in, to sink, to immerse, proceeds in an article on "Baptizo," and in the appended note thereto, to neutralize his own testimony. He intimates that *baptizo* in Mark vii. 7 is equivalent to *nipto*—to wash the hands, feet, or face, which is contradicted by the learned world. He alludes to the scarcity of water in Jerusalem as an argument against the immersion of the first converts after Christ's ascension. The distinguished traveller gives a triumphant answer to the learned lexicographer on this point, as also does Dr. Thomson, in "The Land and the Book," and other writers. These considerations, therefore, show that the testimony of lexicons is not infallible, that the highest authority is Greek usage, and that we ought to "prove all things," and "hold fast that which is good."

CHAPTER III.

BAPTO IN PROFANE AND SACRED WRITINGS.

WE refer to this word in order to notice some of the objections raised against baptism by immersion from some passages in which it occurs, rather than because we deem the usage of it essential to the argument.

It differs from *baptizo* in some respects. Though *baptizo* is derived from *bapto*, it appears, as Dr. Carson has shown, that *bapto* is used to denote *to dip* and *to dye*, but that it is never used to describe the ordinance of baptism; whereas *baptizo*, on the other hand, is never used for *to dye*. We insert the testimony of a few well-known lexicons as to the meaning of this word:—

Dr. E. Robinson's—*Bapto*: to dip in, to immerse; 2, to dip, to dye.

W. Greenfield's—to dip, plunge, immerse.

Rev. J. Parkhurst's—to dip, plunge, immerse.

Dr. John Jones's—I dip for the sake of dyeing, dye, stain; dip a bucket in water, draw.

Liddell and Scott's—to dip in water, to dip in dye, to dye; hence, absol., to dye the hair; to draw water, &c., to draw water by dipping the bucket; intrans. *ναῦς ἔβαψεν*, the ship dipped, sank.

The above lexicographers agree in giving to *bapto* the meanings of *to dip*, and then *to dye*; the word meant at first to dye by dipping the object in the dye, afterwards to dye in any manner, as Liddell and Scott intimate, and as Dr. Carson has proved.

A few instances will suffice to show that *bapto* means in profane authors and in the Holy Scriptures *to dip in*, *to immerse*, *to plunge*.

Homer uses it in this connection :—

As when the smith, a hatchet or large axe,
Tempering with skill, *plunges* (*bapteî*) the hissing blade
Deep in cold water. (Odyss. lib. i. 391, 392.)

It is frequently used for dipping a vessel in water, in order to draw water thereby.

Euripides describes a mother, who was about to wash the body of her dead son, addressing her maid, “Go take a vessel, my good old maid, and *having dipped* it (*bapsas*) in the sea, bring it hither.”

Aristotle, speaking of a certain kind of fish, says :—“They cannot endure great changes, such as if men *should put them into cold water* (*baptozin eis psuchron*) in the summer.” He speaks also of elephants being cured of a certain malady by having warm water given them to drink, and hay, which the men *dipped into honey* (*eis meli baptontes*). He says further that “some nations are accustomed to harden their children by *plunging them into the cold river* (*eis potamon apobaptein psuchron*) soon after their birth.

Another writer (Dion. Harlicarnassus) speaks of one who “*plunged* (*bapsas*) his spear between the ribs” of another.

These instances, which, with many others, may be seen in the works of Gale and Carson, need no comment.

In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, *bapto* occurs in the following passages :—

Exodus xii. 22—“Ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and *dip* (*bapsantes*) it in the blood,” &c.

Lev. iv. 6—“And the priest shall *dip* (*bapsei*) his finger in the blood, &c.”

Lev. xi. 32—“It must *be put into water* (*baphesetai*), &c.”

Josh. iii. 15—“And the feet of the priests that bare the ark *were dipped* (*ebaphesan*) in the brim of the water, &c.”

Ruth ii. 14—“*Dip* (*bapseis*) thy morsel in the vinegar.”

2 Kings viii. 15—“He took a thick cloth, and *dipped* (*ebapsen*) it in water.”

Job ix. 31—“Yet shalt thou *plunge* (*ebapsas*) me in the ditch.”

See also Lev. iv. 17, ix. 9, xiv. 6, 51; Numb. xix. 18; Deut. xxxiii. 24; 1 Sam. xiv. 27; Psalm lxviii. 23.

In the New Testament we find it in the following passages :—

Luke xvi. 24—"Send Lazarus, that he may *dip* (*bapse*) the tip of his finger, &c."

John xiii. 26—"He it is, to whom I shall give a sop when I have *dipped* (*bapsas*) it."

Rev. xix. 13—"He was clothed with a vesture *dipped* (*bebammenon*) in blood."

The other meaning attributed to *bapto* is to *dye*. As Dr. Jones and Liddell and Scott testify in their lexicons, the primary and radical meaning is to dye by dipping, to dip in order to dye, to dip the object in the dye; there are many instances of its use in this sense; in course of time, however, it came to denote dyeing in any manner. This, however, does not affect the ordinance of Christ, for this word is never used for it; the derivative *baptizo* was formed to regulate the meaning of *bapto*; *baptizo* has but one meaning—to *immerse* or *cause to be immersed*; it corresponds to the first meaning of *bapto*.

It is objected from some passages in which *bapto* is used, and from the figurative use of it, that even in its first and primary acceptation, it does not always necessarily mean to *dip in* or *plunge*.

One of the meanings assigned to *bapto* by Moses Stuart is to *smear over* or *moisten* by dipping in, because the preposition *apo* is construed with it, which he translates *by* or *with*:—"Lev. iv. 17. And the priest shall *smear over* or *moisten* (*lapsci*) his finger, (*apo tou haimatos*), *by* or *with the blood of the bullock*: Heb. . וְטָבַל . . . מִן־הַדָּם, *vetabhal . . . min haddam*." The same construction occurs also in Lev. xiv. 16; Exod. xii. 22, which Stuart translates as above. There must have been *dipping* in these instances even if smearing the blood or the oil over the finger was the end in view. It seems, however, as Dr. Ripley in his Examination of Stuart's Essay has convincingly shown, that the proper radical meaning of *bapto*—to *dip*, may be retained, and is in fact intended, in these passages. The Septuagint gives a literal rendering of the Hebrew *min* (מִן) by the Greek *apo*; the meaning of the Greek here, therefore, it is to be determined by the Hebrew idiom; now the Hebrew preposition is often employed to express a partitive meaning—to denote that only a part of what is named was employed; thus our translators understood it: "And the priest shall

dip his finger *in some of the blood* " (Lev. iv. 17). Professor Lee, in his Hebrew Lexicon, observes, "In some cases, the construction is evidently elliptical: *part, portion, something, some, or the like* being understood; as מִדָּם *middam*, *some of the blood*," &c. So also Gesenius and Dr. Davies, in their Hebrew Lexicons. Compare in Hebrew Job xxvii. 6; Cant. i. 2; Dan. xi. 5; Exod. xvii. 5; Gen. xxx. 4. The same act is described in Lev. iv. 6, in the usual construction, (וְיָבִיל בְּדָם *retabhal . . . baddam*). "And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood;" the difference being that in one case he was *to dip it into a part of the blood*, in the other less specifically *into the blood*.

Similarly we find the genitive used with *bapto* in Luke xvi. 24 (βαπτῆ ὕδατος, *bapse hudatos*), "That he may dip the tip of his finger in *some water*." Parkhurst, in his Greek Lexicon, says, "*Baptein hudatos* is a good Greek phrase for *dipping in water*. Thus Homer, *louesthai potamou*, is *to bathe in a river*. *Bapton okeanoio*, dipping in the ocean (See Winer's "Grammar of the New Testament Diction," xxx, 8, c.)

Bapto occurs also in the Septuagint in Daniel iv. 33, v. 21, and is translated by Stuart *moistened*: "His body was *moistened* (*ebaphe*) with the dew of heaven." There is no need, however, to depart from the usual meaning of the word; the words ought to be rendered, "His body was immersed in the dew of heaven." The whole passage is a vivid and graphic description of the condition of Nebuchadnezzar during his madness: "He did eat grass (vegetables) as oxen, and his body was immersed in the dew of heaven, till the hairs were grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws." "To moisten" is too tame an expression in the hyperbolical description given of Nebuchadnezzar; he was exposed in the open air to the copious dews of an oriental climate, and was, as it were, immersed in it. Observe (1) That the Chaldee word in these passages is *tsebae*, which means *to dip* or *immerse*. (2) The Septuagint renders it by three different words: "It shall lie down (*koitasthesetai*) in the dew of heaven" (Dan. iv. 15); "He shall lodge (*aulisthesetai*) in the dew of heaven" (Dan. iv. 23-25); "His body was immersed (*ebaphe*) in the dew of heaven" (Dan. iv. 33, v. 21). The LXX translators may

have intended, by using the different terms, to describe the king as lying down in the open air during the night, immersed in the heavy dew of an Eastern clime. (3) The Syriac translators, who were from the neighbourhood of Babylon, translated the original word by *tsebae*, which means *to plunge* or *immerse*. (4) Let it be borne in mind that the dew is exceedingly copious in oriental countries. "We were sufficiently instructed by experience," says Maundrell, "what the holy Psalmist means by the *dew of Hermon*, our tents being as wet with it as if it had rained all night" (Journey, March 22). Dr. Shaw, speaking of Arabia, says: "The *dews* particularly (as we had the heavens only for our covering) would frequently wet us to the skin" (Travels, p. 440). "Others speak of their cloaks, in which they wrapt themselves while they slept, as being completely wet, as if they had been immersed in the sea" (Dr. Eadie's "Bibl. Cyclopædia," article "Dew").

We find similar expressions in every language. Doddridge paraphrases Ephes. ii. 12: "*Having no well-grounded hope with regard to the future state, . . . immersed as you were in the cares and pleasures of this lower world.*" D'Aubigné, speaking of Zwingle, says that "the reformer retired *bathed* in tears;" and in describing Luther at the Wartburg he says that he was often "*immersed* in profound meditations" ("History of the Reformation," vol. ii. pp. 11, 387, Blackie's edition, 1855). Earl Russell, in addressing the Devon Association for the Advancement of Literature, in 1866, apologised that he had not had leisure to study science and literature, "*immersed* as he had been in political waters" (*Morning Star*, August 10, 1866). The classics and all literature abound with such expressions and nobody stumbles at them; why then take offence at a figurative use of *bapto*, and violate just rules of interpretation by endeavouring to illustrate the literal meaning of it by its figurative use?

The same construction occurs in Daniel as in the Pentateuch. In Daniel iv. 15, 23, the Chaldee has the preposition *beth* (*in*) construed with the verb *tsebae*—*to dip, immerse* in the dew of heaven, for which *en* (*in*) stands in the Septuagint with the verbs already pointed out; but in chaps. iv. 33, and v. 21, the Chaldee has the preposition *min* (*from*) construed with the same verb *tsebae*, for which the Septuagint has *apo* (*from*) and *bapto*. The Greek here (if it be not too

great a presumption in one to say so, after the Rev. Dr. Halley gave it up in despair, "The Sacraments," Part I. p. 362, edition 1854) is probably to be explained on the same principle as that in Lev. iv. 17, already alluded to. Nebuchadnezzar's body was to be immersed in a part of the dew of heaven, *i.e.*, in that which so abundantly surrounded and covered him; while the same meaning is set forth in Dan. iv. 15, by means of the usual construction.

CHAPTER IV.

BAPTIZO IN GREEK WRITINGS.

AFTER the publication of so many works on the mode of baptism, especially the very valuable work of the late Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, M.A., on "The Act of Baptism," and the learned and exhaustive treatise of Dr. Conant on "The Meaning and Use of Baptizein," it is not necessary to dwell long on this subject; it will suffice to adduce a few instances from different writers in order to show how the word *baptizo* was used and understood by them. We have already brought forward the testimony of Lexicons which assign to this word the meaning of *to immerse, to dip, to sink, or cause to be immersed or overwhelmed*. We shall now illustrate this by examples.

I. INSTANCES OF PARTIAL IMMERSION.

Polybius's Hist. B. 34, *ch.* 3, 7 :—"They passed through with difficulty, the foot-soldiers *being immersed* (Gr., *baptizomenoi*) as far as to the breasts."

Strabo's Geography, B. 12, *ch.* 3, 9 :—"Alexander happening to be there at the stormy season, and accustomed to trust, for the most part to fortune, set forward before the swell subsided, and they marched the whole day in water *immersed* (Gr., *baptizomenon*), as far as to the waist."

Porphyry, concerning the Styx :—"The depth is as far as to the knees; and when the accused comes to it, if he is guiltless, he goes through without fear, having the water as far as to the knees; but if guilty, after proceeding a little way, he is *immersed* (Gr., *baptizetai*) unto the head."

Heliodorus, Aethiopics, B. 5, *ch.* 28 :—"And already *becoming immersed* (Gr., *baptizomenon*), and wanting little of

sinking, some of the pirates at first attempted to leave, and get aboard of their own bark."

Achilles Tatius, Story of Clitophon and Leucippe, B. 3., ch. 1. :—"We all, therefore, shifted our position to the more elevated part of the ship, in order that we might lighten that part of the ship that was immersed (Gr., *baptizomenôn*)."

II. INSTANCES OF TOTAL IMMERSION.

Aristotle Concerning Wonderful Reports, 136 :—"They say that the Phœnicians who inhabit the so-called Gadira, sailing four days outside of the Pillars of Hercules with an east wind, come to certain desert places full of rushes and seaweed; which when it is ebb-tide, are not immersed (Gr., *baptizesthai*), but when it is floodtide are overflowed (Gr., *kalakluzesthai*).

Lucian, Timon, or the Man-hater, 44 :—"And if the winter's torrent were bearing one away, and he with outstretched hands were imploring help, to thrust him headlong, immersing (Gr., *baptizonta*) him, so that he should not be able to come up again."

Dion Cassius, Roman History, B. 37, ch. 58 :—"Describing the effects of a storm, he says : "Many trees were up turned by the roots, and many houses were thrown down; the ships which were in the Tiber, and lying at anchor by the city and at its mouth, were submerged (Gr., *baptisthenai*), and the wooden bridge was destroyed."

Josephus, Jewish War, B. 1, ch. 22, 2 :—"And there according to command, being immersed (Gr., *baptizomenos*), by the Gauls in a swimming-bath, he dies."

The same work, B. 3, ch. 9. 3 :—"And many (of the vessels), struggling against the opposing swell towards the open sea, the billow, rising high above, submerged (Gr., *ebaptisen*).

The same writer, Antiq. of the Jews, B. 9, ch. 10, 2.—Speaking of Jonah's flight, he says :—"The ship being just about to be submerged" (Gr., *baptizesthai*).

Do., Life of Himself, § 3 :—"For our vessel having been submerged (Gr., *baptisthentos*) in the midst of the Adriatic, being about six hundred in number, we swam through the whole night."

The following figurative instances of the word are based on such usages as the above :—

Josephus, Jewish War, B. 4, ch. 3, 3 :—Speaking of the robbers in Jerusalem, he says :—"Who, even apart from the sedition, afterwards *plunged* (Gr., *ebaptisan*), the city," that is, into calamities.

The LXX, Isaiah xxi. 4 : "Iniquity *plungeth* (Gr., *baptizei*) me," that is, into terror or distress, as Parkhurst remarks.

Himerius, Selection 15, section 3.—Speaking of Themistocles, he says, "He was great at Salamis, for there fighting he *plunged* (Gr. *ebaptize*) all Asia," namely, into disgrace.

Theophylact, on Matt. iii. 11 :—"He will *immeres* (Gr., *baptisei*) you in the Holy Spirit. That is, he will *deluge* you *ungrudgingly* (Gr. *kataklusei aphthonos*) with the graces of the Spirit." (Compare Matt. xx. 22, 23.)

III. INSTANCES IN WHICH THE IMMERSION WAS TEMPORARY.

Josephus, Jewish Antiq. B. 15, ch. 3, 3 :—Describing the murder of the boy Aristobulus, who agreeably to the command of Herod was drowned in a swimming-bath, he says :—"Continually pressing down and *immersing* (Gr. *baptizontes*) him while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him."

Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 24 :—"A bladder, thou mayest be *immersed* (Gr., *baptize*), but it is not possible for thee to sink (Gr. *dunai*)."

The same writer, Life of Alexander, 67 :—Describing a season of revelry, in the army of Alexander the Great, he says, "The soldiers, along the whole way, *dipping* (Gr., *baptizontes*) with cups, and horns, and goblets, from great wine-jars and mixing-bowls, were drinking to one another."

Hippocrates, on Epidemics, B. 5 :—Describing the respiration of a patient, he says, "And she breathed, as persons breathe after having been *immersed* (Gr., *bebaptisthai*), and emitted a low sound from the chest, like the so-called ventriloquists."

Æsop's Fables (of the mule) :—"One of the salt-bearing mules, rushing into a river, accidentally slipped down ; and rising up lightened (the salt becoming dissolved), he perceived the cause, and remembered it ; so that always in passing through the river, he purposely lowered down and *immersed* (Gr., *baptizein*) the panniers."

Achilles Tatius, Story of Clitophon and Leucipp, B. 4,

ch. 18 :—Describing how the Egyptian boatmen drink water from the Nile, he says :—“ Their drinking-cup is the hand. For if any of them is thirsty while sailing, stooping forward from the vessel he directs his face towards the stream, and lets his hand into the water ; and *dipping* (Gr., *baptisas*) it hollowed, and filling it with water, he darts the draught towards his mouth, and hits the mark.”

The LXX., 2 Kings v. 14 :—“ And Naaman went down and *immersed himself* (Gr., *ebaptisato*) in the Jordan seven times.”

REMARKS.

The above instances suggest and teach us two or three things :—

1. That the essential meaning of *baptizo* is *to immerse*, or *cause to be immersed*.

The immersion may be but *partial*, as in the instances adduced above under I. ; but when it is so, the limitation is always specified, as in all the above examples.

It may be a *permanent submersion*, as in the instances in which ships are described as having sunk or been sunk, referred to in the examples under II. Or it may be but a *transient* or *temporary immersion*, like that of the hand in the river while raising a draught from it ; or that of a bladder in the sea while pressed down for an instant in the storm ; or like the dipping of the panniers in crossing a river. The dipping of Aristobulus must have been repeated again and again, until at last life was gone. Naaman immersed himself seven times. The radical idea is immersion ; the context shows whether it be partial or total, temporary or permanent. In the baptism of the disciple of Christ, it is to be a total immersion, as there is no modifying clause in connection with the account given of the ordinance in the New Testament ; and temporary, of course, from the nature of the case, and because it is to resemble the burial and resurrection of Christ, and to symbolise the Christian's own resurrection to a holy life.

2. That the synonyms of *baptizo*, and the words used in the context, show that it means what is affirmed.

In the first and last instances under II., the verb *katakluzo*—to *overflow*, to *overwhelm*, to *deluge*—which occurs in 2 Pet. iii. 6, is used as its equivalent. No other meaning than

immersion will suit the context, and make the figurative use of the word intelligible.

3. The sophistry of some recent writers on baptism. The above examples show, for instance, the absurdity of Professor Godwin's theory respecting the meaning of baptizo. "*Baptizo*" (says the professor) "denotes to put or keep under water in any way, and would be inappropriate to transient dipping" (Godwin's "*Christian Baptism*," p. 25). "If, then, it were necessary to abide by the common classic signification of the word, none need be *dipped* in baptism, but all would probably be drowned" (Ibid., p. 34). If Naaman immersed himself in the Jordan seven times, he supposes that *bapto* or some other common word would have been used to describe the act (Ibid., p. 48). We have found, however, that *baptizo* is not too sacred a word to describe the act of immersion, and that a transient dipping. In the following quotation from the writings of Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, in A.D. 350 ("Preface to the Instructions"), both *bapto* and *baptizo* are used to describe the act of baptism, and both denote immersion. Simon, also, the magician, once came to the bath. "He was *immersed* (Gr. *ebaptisthe*), but he was not enlightened; and the body indeed he *dipped* (Gr. *ebapsen*) in water, but the heart he did not enlighten by the Spirit. And the body went down indeed, and came up; but the soul was not buried with Christ, nor was it raised up by Him." Professor Godwin acknowledges that there are three passages in which *baptizo* may denote transient dipping ("*Christian Baptism*," pp. 33, 34). These ought to have convinced the professor of the fallacy of his own reasoning. But he consoles himself that "there are only three" of them! But two or three witnesses are enough to substantiate a fact. The instances, however, are by no means so scanty as the professor intimates. We have adduced seven of them under III., without including those which he acknowledges, and had selected more.

Baptizo, moreover, is used when water is out of the question. It is used for plunging a sword into one's body. Josephus, describing the death of one Simon by his own hand, says, "he *plunged* (Gr., *ebaptise*) the whole sword into his own neck" ("*Jewish Wars*," Book ii., ch. 18-4). Chrysostom speaks of some "who were exhorting to *plunge* (Gr., *baptisai*) the sword into the enemy's breast" ("*Select*

Discourses," 29, on "Clemency"). There is neither putting into nor keeping under water in these instances, for water is out of the question. "Buy the truth, and sell it not; also wisdom, and instruction, and understanding" (Prov. xxiii. 23).

The quotations in the foregoing chapter may be seen in the original Greek in Dr. Conant's work on "*Baptizein*," whose translation of them I have, for the most part, followed.

CHAPTER V.

JEWISH ABLUTIONS.

WE find in the Holy Scriptures and the uninspired writings of the Jews, frequent references to the ablutions of the children of Israel; and as the verb *baptizo* is used to denote such acts, we shall briefly refer to the instances in which it occurs. In 2 Kings v. 14, we read of Naaman, in compliance with the direction of the prophet Elisha, immersing himself (Gr. *ebaptisato*, Heb. *tabal*), seven times in the Jordan. He was commanded to wash, *i. e.*, bathe (Heb. *rachas*); he carried out the instruction of the prophet by immersing himself. If the Hebrew verb *rachas* means sometimes to wash without referring to the mode, it is undeniable that it means in some instances to bathe, to immerse, and no other meaning suits the context. This is the meaning ascribed to it by Gesenius in Exod. ii. 5, where it is said that the daughter of Pharaoh came down to wash herself at the river; and in Ruth iii. 3, where Naomi directs her daughter-in-law to wash herself. See also Exod. xxx. 20, and Job ix. 30. It seems that the different sprinklings that were to take place upon the unclean were preliminary and preparatory rites, and that the ceremony of immersion, or bathing, was the last in order to attain purification. "He SHALL WASH HIS FLESH IN WATER (Heb. *rachas-bammayim*), and he shall be clean," Lev. xiv. 9; Num. xix. 19. Sometimes only the concluding ceremony of bathing or immersion is recorded, all the other rites being supposed to have been performed: see Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25, "He that immerseth himself (*baptizomenos*) from a dead body, and toucheth it again, what is he profited by his bathing" (τῷ λουτρῷ)? This last passage is elliptical, meaning, "He that immerseth himself in order to be freed

from the pollution contracted by contact with the dead." The immersion was the means whereby purification was attained. See a similar construction in Hebrews x. 22.

The Assembly of Divines' Annotations on 2 Kings v. 14, are as follows:—"He went up deep in the river, and drenched himself over head and ears, so oft as the prophet had enjoined him. The leprosy was spread over his whole body from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet, therefore he so dipped himself."

Unclean vessels were also to be dipped in water:—"And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is done, it MUST BE PUT INTO WATER, and it shall be unclean until the even; so it shall be cleansed" (Lev. xi. 32). Compare Mark vii. 3, where the word *baptismoî* is used for the immersion of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables. The word that stands for "tables" is *klinê*, and denotes properly a bed, i. e., either a mat, quilt, or mattress, on which the poor in the East sleep, or a couch for sitting or reclining. In either case, there would have been no difficulty in immersing it. There was no difficulty in immersing such a bed as the paralytic was told to take up and go with it to his house (Matt. ix. 6). And even if we consider the word *klinê* in this instance to denote the framework of the bed, the difficulty is by no means insurmountable. The Jewish canons run thus: "A bed (*mittah*) that is wholly defiled, if he dips it part by part, it is pure." Again: "If he dips the bed in it (viz., the pool of water), although its feet are plunged into the thick clay (at the bottom of the pool), it is clean" (Dr. Gill on Mark vii. 4). "The later Jews even directed that the framework of the couches should be taken in pieces and dipped" (the R. T. S.'s Annotated Paragraph Bible on Mark vii.).

Jewish authorities support the view advocated above. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel paraphrase the expression, "He shall bathe himself in water," occurring so frequently in Leviticus xv. thus, "He shall bathe in forty seahs (about sixty gallons) of water."

Ainsworth, on Lev. xv. 11, says that the Jewish Rabbis teach that, "Wheresoever in the law washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else than the washing of the whole body. For if any wash himself all over,

except the very top of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness."

Macknight observes that, "In the Levitical ritual many *baptisms*, or immersions of the body in water, were enjoined as emblematical of the purity of mind which is necessary to the worshipping of God acceptably" (Heb. vi. 2). Some indeed assert that *divers washings* (*baptismoi*) in Heb. ix. 10, include *sprinklings* as well as *bathings* or *immersions*; but this is merely begging the question. As the meaning of the word *baptism* is immersion, the *different baptisms* (*διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς*) referred to must be the different bathings or the various plungings of priest, Levites, and people, in order to be purified from their various kinds of pollution.

Hammond, in his Annotations on Matthew iii. a., says that the priests, before entering the temple, put off their clothes and washed or immersed the whole body; whereas the washing of the hands and feet, which was done ten times a day, was done in the Temple.

In later times, the Jews were accustomed, on special occasions, to bathe before meals. "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they carefully wash their hands, do not eat, holding the tradition of the elders. And coming from the market, except they immerse themselves (*Gr. baptizontai*), they do not eat" (Mark vii. 3, 4, *Am. B. U. Version*). As the Jews ate with their hands without using any instrument, they were very scrupulous about their ablutions, and always washed their hands before they ate; and when they returned from the market, fearing they had contracted defilement by coming in contact with some unclean person or thing, they took a bath before they partook of their meals. Hammond and Meyer say that *baptizo* in Mark, vii. 4, refers to the latter. The verb *baptizo* is used in Luke xi. 38, in the same sense. Herodotus refers to a similar custom among the Egyptians. If an Egyptian, said he, touched a pig in passing, he would run to the river, and dip himself with his clothes on (*Eterpe*, ii. 47).

The custom of bathing before meals obtained among other nations, as well as the Jews, and that when religious considerations were out of the question. The Greeks used to take a bath before the principal meal (*deipnon*) of the day. "It was usual with the Romans to take the bath after exercise, and before the principal meal (*coena*) of the day; but the

debauchees of the Empire bathed also after eating as well as before, in order to promote digestion, and to acquire a new appetite for fresh delicacies." (Dr. W. Smith's "Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiq." Article, "*Balista*.")

Josephus relates that the Essenes, after clothing themselves in white veils, used to bathe in cold water, and after this they dined ("Wars of the Jews," B. II., viii. 5.) See also Webster and Wilkinson's Greek Testament, on John xiii. 10, where it is said that it was customary to take a bath before the principal meal, and at the latter end of the day.

If the Jews and other nations took a bath as a general custom, is it incredible that the Pharisees on coming from the market should do so as a religious ceremony?

Some understand *baptizo* in Mark vii. 4, as referring to the hands. The Jews had two methods of washing their hands: one was called simply *Netilâh*, or washing, in which water was poured upon the hands; the other was called *Tebilah*, *plunging*, because the hands were plunged in water. (See Gill, Hammond, and Lightfoot, on Mark vii. 3, 4, and Kitto's Cycl., Art. "*Ablution*.")

The case of Judith is adduced sometimes as a triumphant refutation of our view of the subject. "And she arose at the morning watch, and sent to Holofernes, saying, Let my lord give command to allow thine handmaid to go forth for prayer; and Holofernes commanded the bodyguards not to hinder her. And she remained in the camp three days, and went forth by night into the valley of Bethulia, and immersed herself (Gr. *ebaptizeto*) in the camp at the fountain" (Judith xii. 5—7). She, who had entered the camp to take away the life of the General, had courage enough to go through her devotions in the alien camp under cover of the night. The difficulties of the case may be removed if we attend to the following considerations:—

1. She could have made any other use of water, for purification, in her own tent.

2. There was an abundance of water for immersion at Bethulia. There are several references to its fountains in the Book of Judith, vi. 11; vii. 12, 13, and 17. It is said that she immersed herself *by* the fountain (*epi tes peges*) in the camp, *i.e.*, probably in a confluence of water near it, where there was depth enough for her to sink down till the whole body was immersed.

3. She did this in the night, when the soldiers could not see her, and annoy her. She was probably accompanied by her maid (x. 5, 10).

4. Every part of the camp was not equally exposed. She seemed to have resorted to a secluded part of it, where she used to pray to her God, and go through her devotions (xi. 17; xii. 7).

5. She was at liberty to act as she pleased, being honoured by the General (xii. 1—7).

6. She might have immersed herself while covered with a suitable garment.

Lightfoot, on Matt. iii. 6, quotes Maimonides, who says:—"If any should enter into the water with their clothes on, yet their washing holds good, because the water would pass through their clothes, and their garments would not hinder it." Josephus speaks of the Essenes:—"The women go into the baths (*loutra*) with some of their garments on, as the men do with somewhat girded about them" ("Wars of the Jews," B. II. viii. 13).

Several authors have taken the above as the right view of this passage. Spencer, in his work on the "Ritual Laws of the Hebrews," says, "That the Jews also, (*i.e.*) as well as the Gentiles) when about to perform their vows, sometimes cleansed the whole body in a bath. I gather from the history of Judith, who, when she had resolved to pray, is said to have baptized herself in a fountain of water." Parkhurst has the following remark in his Lexicon, under Baptizo:—"The LXX use *baptizomai* mid. for *washing oneself by immersion*, answering to the Heb. *tabal*, 2 Kings v. 14, comp. verse 10. Thus also it is applied in the apocryphal books, Judith xii. 7, Eccles. xxxiv. 25." There is nothing, then, in the circumstances of this case which prevents us from ascribing to *baptizo* the usual meaning of to immerse, dip, sink, or cause to be immersed, or overwhelmed.

Professor Godwin renders a passage from Clement of Alexandria as follows:—"This is the custom of the Jews, so that even on a bed (*ἐπὶ κοίτῃ*) they are frequently baptized"; and adduces it as a "clear and decisive testimony" that Jewish baptisms were administered to a sick person in bed. ("Christian Baptism," p. 53.) Dr. Carson gives the true explanation of this passage when he says, "This passage refers to the nightly pollutions after which bathing was prescribed

by the law of Moses." They were immersed "on account of the bed"; that is, pollution contracted there. (Carson "on Baptism," p. 492.) Professor Godwin, on page 153 of his work, informs his readers that *epi* with the dative means *with regard to, on account of*, so that he cannot object to Dr. Carson's correction.

The reader will be, by this time, prepared to share the surprise of the writer, when reading the following and other similar assertions from the pen of Professor Godwin:—"No immersion of a person in water was ever enjoined by Jewish law; and no public immersion of persons with their clothes on took place in ancient purifications. The practice of bathing in water, as a religious service, did not appear among Jews or Christians till later times"!! (Professor Godwin's "Gospel of Matthew," chap. iii.) All antiquity and the testimony of the learned world must, therefore, go for nothing!

(See Ripley's "Examination of Stuart's Essay;" Gale's "Reflections;" and B. W. Noel's "External Act of Baptism.")

CHAPTER VI.

BAPTIZO IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

HAVING in the previous chapters noticed the meaning of "baptizo," and adduced the testimony of lexicons and instances from Greek writers, we now proceed to show that the idea of immersion is suitable to all the passages in which baptizo occurs in the New Testament, whereas that of sprinkling or pouring is inadequate to express the meaning.

We have in the last chapter dwelt upon its use in those passages that refer to Jewish ablutions; we shall now briefly allude to other passages.

We believe that the natural inference of an impartial reader of the New Testament is (even were the meaning of baptizo indefinite, which is not granted) that baptism was administered at first by immersion. John baptized not "with," but "in (*iv*) water," "in (*iv*) Jordan," and "in Aenon, near to Salim, because there was much water there," "as the rite of immersion required" (Bengel), Matt. iii. 6—11; John iii. 23. Jesus was baptized into the Jordan, literally, says Dr. Blomfield, with whom Dr. Halley agrees, was "dipped or plunged into" it (Mark i. 9). After being baptized He went up out of the water and away from the river (Matt. iii. 16; Mark i. 10). Philip and the eunuch "went down into the water," at which they had previously arrived; and after Philip had baptized the eunuch they both "came up out of the water" (Acts viii. 36—39). The Romans and the Colossians had been buried with Christ in baptism, and raised together with Him in the same ordinance (Romans vi. 4; Col. ii. 12). The natural inference from these passages must be that baptism was administered in the apostolic age by immersion.

The converts on the day of Pentecost were baptized probably in some of the public baths of Jerusalem, or in its pools

and reservoirs : for at that time the disciples had “favour with all the people” (Acts ii. 47). “The frequency with which such reservoirs are met (says Dr. Samson, late of Columbia College, U. S.) not only in Palestine, but in Southern Italy and the whole Levant, removes from the mind of the inquiring traveller all difficulty as to facilities for immersion at Jerusalem, Philippi, Corinth, Rome, and elsewhere in the Apostles’ day ; as from the mind of the late Dr. Judson the same difficulty was removed by observing the baths in the jail-yards of Burmah and India.”

The pools of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood are well known, of which, according to the late Dr. Robinson, the following are the dimensions :—

Names.	Length.	Breadth.	Depth.
Pool of Bethesda	360 feet	130 feet	75 feet
Upper Gihon	316 "	200 "	18 "
Lower Gihon	592 "	245 to 275 "	35 to 42 "
Pool of Hezekiah	210 "	144 "	Not great "
Solomon's Pools—Lower Pool ..	582 "	148 to 207 "	East end 50 "
Middle Pool ..	423 "	160 " 250 "	" 39 "
Upper Pool ..	380 "	229 " 236 "	" 25 "
Pool of Siloam	53 "	18 "	19 "

In treating of the supply of water at Jerusalem, mention ought to be made of its cisterns also. “I have already spoken (says Dr. Robinson) of the immense cisterns now and anciently existing within the area of the Temple, supplied partly from rain-water and partly by the aqueduct. Those of themselves, in case of a siege, would furnish a tolerable supply. But, in addition to these, almost every private house in Jerusalem, of any size, is understood to have at least one or more cisterns, excavated in the soft limestone-rock on which the city is built. The house of Mr. Lanneau, in which he resided, had no less than four cisterns ; and as these are but a specimen of the manner in which all the better class of houses are supplied, I subjoin here the dimensions :—

	Length.	Breadth.	Depth.
1.	15 feet	8 feet	12 feet.
2.	8 "	4 "	15 "
3.	10 "	10 "	15 "
4.	30 "	30 "	20 "

This last is enormously large, and the numbers given are the least estimate" (Robinson's "Biblical Researches," vol. i. pp. 480-514; vol. ii. pp. 164, 165). As any depth could be readily obtained in such cisterns, it would have been easy to baptize in them.

"The suggestion may arise in some minds" (says Dr. Samson, already referred to), "that, when the pools of Jerusalem above described were full, the great depth of water would render them ill-fitted for immersion." The difficulty will be removed by the following considerations:—The supply of rain-water in these pools is now exhausted (and probably always was) early in the spring. As we have seen, on the testimony of Dr. Robinson and others, the main and permanent supply of water in all these pools is from aqueducts fed by springs. Of course the supply except during the winter and early spring, would be a gradual one, and the depth of water could be graduated at pleasure. We have seen that this is now precisely the fact at the two pools on the east side of the city; the people keeping the water at just such a height as they desire. That the same practice was pursued in our Saviour's day is evident; for the Pool of Bethesda was then supplied with just the amount of water sufficient for bathing. Further on, we shall perceive that the lower pool of Gihon, the largest of all these pools, is adapted, even when full, to immersion" ("Baptismal Tracts for the Times," pp. 111-161; Boston, 1851). The remark of Dr. Robinson, that the bottom of the Pool of Hezekiah is levelled, but that the rock on the west side is cut down for some depth, and that of the Rev. George Williams ("Historical and Descriptive Memoir on Jerusalem," 1842, p. 19), that the water was only in one corner of it when he saw it, prove that the bottom is sloping, and, therefore, favourable for descent into the water. It is evident from the Gospels that the Pools of Bethesda and of Siloam were accessible to all (John v. 2, 3; ix. 7). In the sixth century, Antoninus the Martyr says that the people bathed constantly in Siloam. The Lower Pool of Gihon was formed by two dams built across the bed of the valley, while the sides were the natural slopes of the valley itself, and any depth could, therefore, be easily obtained.

Paul, it is reasonable to conclude, was baptized either in one of the rivers of Damascus, as Conybeare and Howson

intimate, or in a reservoir or cistern belonging to the house, as we have shown might have been the case. The place of Lydia's baptism was, doubtless (say Conybeare and Howson), the stream at which she and her friends had assembled for prayer. The Philippian jailor was baptized, in the opinion of the same learned authors, in a well or fountain of water within the precincts of the prison, in which he himself had washed the wounds of Paul and Silas.

The words of Peter, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized," &c. ? (Acts x. 47), cannot mean more than—"Who can object to their being baptized, and thus admitted into Christ's visible Church, seeing they have been accepted of God through faith as well as we?" None dared to do so, though they were Gentiles : "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

The word baptizo is used to show forth burial and resurrection with Christ—the overwhelming sufferings of the Son of God—the abundance of the gifts of the Holy Spirit—the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, and, also, it is probable, to prefigure the resurrection of the dead.

The idea of immersion is suitable to all these passages—Rom. vi. 4, "We are buried with him by baptism (*dia tou baptismatos*) into death." This burial is by means of baptism. "The apostle does not teach that we are crucified with Christ, or are dead with Christ, or possess a mortified temper, by baptism. To have such a state of soul, to be dead in respect to sin, is one thing, and to be buried with Christ by baptism, is quite a different thing; for this is external, whereas the other is internal. The one is a sign; the other the thing signified." (Prof. Chase on the "Design of Baptism.") This burial by baptism is the burial of the dead—of the man that has been brought by grace to die to sin, and who, like his Master, is raised again to live to God. "This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." (Conybeare and Howson.)

Luke xii. 50.—"I have a baptism to be baptized with." The Saviour's agonies and sufferings were indescribable when the comforting influences of God's gracious presence were withheld from Him; the waters came in unto the soul, the floods overwhelmed Him, He sank in deep waters, and was

immersed in a sea, as it were, of grievous afflictions and sufferings (Psalm lxi. 1, 2), so that He cried in the depth of His agony, " My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me ? " What figure more appropriate to represent the greatness and intensity of His sufferings than baptism ? " I am to be immersed in afflictions " (Hammond). " He taketh an expression from the manner of baptizing by immersion or dipping over head and ears in the water " (The Assembly's Annotations on Matt. xx. 22).

Matt. iii. 11.—" He shall baptize you in (ἐν) the Holy Ghost." The abundance of the Spirit's gifts and influences is set forth by the baptism of the Spirit. It did not consist in the descent of the Spirit, any more than the celebration of the Lord's Supper consists in the carrying of the elements to the Lord's house, or that baptism consists in the bringing of water into the baptistery ; the descent of the Spirit was prior and preparatory to the baptism. The baptism of the Apostles in the Holy Spirit consisted in their being immersed in its influences after it was given. It came upon them like a heavenly flood, by which they were overwhelmed, and in which they were immersed. " He shall baptize, or immerse, you in the Holy Ghost and in fire. He will either entirely immerse you in the Holy Ghost as penitents, or if impenitent, He will overwhelm you with the fire of judgment, and then hell fire " (Lange).

1 Cor. x. 2.—" And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." In the act of baptism, there are three things involved, viz., the descent into the water, the burial in and under it, and the emersion from it. Thus the Israelites went down into the Red Sea, were there buried and hidden in the sea and under the cloud, and then emerged on the other side ; by which act they pledged themselves to be the followers of Moses, the servant of God and their law-giver, and were, so to speak, baptized unto him.

1 Cor. xv. 29.—" What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all ? " Why are they then baptized for the dead ? The Apostle alludes probably to baptism as an act prefiguring the resurrection of the dead, when he speaks of being baptized for the dead ; in which case the idea of immersion only suits his purpose. " Why then have they (the deniers of the resurrection) in their baptism made profession of their belief of it (see v. 14, 17), it being certain

that the resurrection of the dead is one of the articles, and that a prime and special one, to the belief of which they were baptized, and to which, baptism (being the putting in and taking out of the water) doth refer, as a significant emblem, first of Christ's then of our resurrection from the grave?" (Hammond).

1 Pet. iii. 21.—"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Peter speaks of baptism as the antitype of the deluge and of the safe deliverance of Noah and his family from that awful visitation. Without now dwelling upon this passage, we observe that the idea of immersion is peculiarly appropriate to it. Noah was buried, as it were, in the waters of the deluge; he was shut up in the ark; the mighty flood surrounded him; the clouds emptied their contents upon the ark and overwhelmed it, so that it may be said that he was immersed in the deluge, though he escaped its curse.

Now, if we regard sprinkling as the mode, how misleading is the graphic account of the New Testament of the baptism of the Son of God, and of the multitude by John, of the sufferings of Emmanuel, and of the believer's burial and resurrection with Christ! Was it a few drops only of suffering that Christ endured, the anticipation of which filled Him with sore agony? Baptism is spoken of as a burial and a resurrection; in sprinkling there is neither burial nor resurrection, neither going down nor coming up, neither an antitype of the deluge, nor an emblem of the last resurrection.

There are two or three considerations which may be mentioned as corroborative evidence of the truth of the preceding observations:—

1. The prepositions which are construed with *baptizo* as contrasted with those used with other terms.

They are *in* (ἐν), and *into* (εἰς), and the local dative denoting *wherein*, when the preposition *in* (ἐν) is understood. The construction is never to *baptize water upon*, but to *baptize the person or the object in or into the element*. On the other hand, the preposition *upon* (ἐπὶ) is used with the terms used for to *pour* (ἐκχεο), *sprinkle* (ραντίζο), *rain* (βρέχο), &c.

2. The other terms used to denote the act of baptism.

The verb *louo* is used (Heb. x. 22), which denotes the bathing or the immersing of the whole body, not merely the hands and face, which is expressed by *nipto*. The noun *loutron* is

used, which means a *bath*, or the act of bathing or immersion (Ephes. iii. 5: Tit. iii. 5). The verb *sunthapto*,—*to bury with* any one, is also used for the act of baptism (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12). Herodotus (v. 5) makes use of the same verb to denote the literal burial of a wife with her husband in the same grave.

The inference from the whole is, that the New Testament cannot be rightly understood and consistently expounded except on Baptist principles.

CHAPTER VII.

BAPTISM IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

WE have shown that the only baptism known in the apostolic churches was baptism by immersion ; we now proceed to notice that that was the only baptism known in the ages immediately succeeding that of the Apostles, until the belief prevailed that baptism was essential to salvation, when perfusion was adopted instead of immersion, in the case of the sick. The general practice, however, for fourteen centuries was immersion, and this continues to be the mode even to this day in all countries which have not, at some time or other, acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope of Rome.

The following quotations will speak for themselves :—

CENT. I.—*Barnabas*.—"We go down into (*katabainomen eis*) the water full of sin and pollution ; but come up again (*anabainomen*) bringing forth fruit in our hearts, and having the fear and hope which are in Christ Jesus."

CENT. II.—*Justin Martyr*, A.D. 140.—"As many as are persuaded and believe that the things which are taught by us are true, and promise to be able to live accordingly, are taught to pray, and beg God with fasting, to grant them forgiveness of their former sins ; and we pray and fast with them. Then we bring them where there is water ; and after the same manner of regeneration, as we also ourselves were regenerated, they are regenerated ; for in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, they are then *bathed* in the water (*to en to hudati tote loutron poiountai*)." *Apologia I.*, § 61.

CENT. III.—(1.) *Tertullian*, A.D. 204.—"Know ye not, that so many of us as were immersed (*tincti sumus*) into Christ Jesus, were immersed (*tincti sumus*) into His death?"

"Then we are thrice immersed (*ter mergitamur*), answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel."

“As of baptism itself there is a bodily act, in that we are immersed in water (*in aquâ mergimur*), a spiritual effect, in that we are freed from sin.”

(2.) *Hippolytus, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 220.*—“For thou hast just heard how Jesus came to John, and was baptized by him in the Jordan. O wonderful transaction! How was the boundless ‘river that makes glad the city of God,’ bathed in a little water (*en oligo hudati eloueto*); the incomprehensible fountain that sends forth life to all men, and has no end, covered (*ekalupteto*) by scanty and transitory waters?”

(3.) *Gregory Thaumaturgus, A.D. 245.*—He uses the verb *KATADUO*—to plunge or go down into—as equivalent to baptizo, when speaking of the baptism of Christ: “Plunge me into the waters of Jordan (*kataduson me tois Jordanou rheithrois*).”

CENT. IV.—Basil the Great, A.D. 330. (1.)—“Imitating the burial of Christ by the baptism; for the bodies of those that are baptized are as it were buried in the water (*enthaptetai to hudati*).”

(2.) *Jerome, A.D. 370.*—“And thrice we are immersed (*ter mergimur*), that there may appear one sacrament of the Trinity.”

(3.) *Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 370.*—“For as Jesus assuming the sins of the world died, that having slain sin He might raise thee up in righteousness; so also thou going down into the water, and in a manner buried in the waters (*en tois hudasi tapheis*) as He in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life.”

“For as he who sinks down in the waters (*ho endunon en tois hudasi*) and is baptized, is surrounded on all sides by the waters, so also they who are baptized by the Spirit are wholly covered over.”

(4.) *Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 398.*—“For to be baptized and sink down (*kataduesthai*), then to emerge (*ananeuein*), is a symbol of the descent into Hades, and of the ascent from thence. Therefore Paul calls baptism the tomb (*ton taphon*), saying, ‘We were buried therefore with Him by means of baptism into death.’”

“Divine symbols are therein celebrated, burial and deadness, and resurrection and life. And all these take place together; for when we sink (*kataduonton*) our heads down in the water as in a kind of tomb, the old man is buried, and,

sinking down beneath, is all concealed at once; then when we emerge (*ananeuonton*) the new man comes up again."

The above, and scores of similar examples, together with references to the works quoted, may be seen in Dr. Gale's "Reflections" and Dr. Conant's "*Baptizein*."

That it was in this light that our ecclesiastical historians understood the records of the ancient Church appears from the following testimonies:—

Mosheim's Eccles. History, Cent. I.—"In this century baptism was administered in convenient places, without the public assemblies, and by immersing the candidates wholly in water."

Ibid. Cent. II.—"The candidates for baptism were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity."

Neander's Church Hist., vol. i. p. 359 (Rose's Translation).—"Baptism was originally administered by immersion, and many of the comparisons of St. Paul allude to this form of its administration: the immersion is a symbol of death, of being buried with Christ; the coming forth from the water is a symbol of a resurrection with Christ; and both taken together represent the second birth, the death of the old man, and a resurrection to a new life."

Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of Paul, vol. i. p. 518, ed. 1872.—"It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being placed beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from his momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness."

Dr. Philip Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, vol. ii. pp. 256-258.—"As to the outward mode of administering this ordinance, immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, used to designate the rite. Then, again, by the analogy of the baptism of John, which was performed in the Jordan (iv, Matt. iii 6, compare 16; also εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, Mark i. 9). Furthermore, by the New Testament comparisons of baptism with the passage through the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 2), with the flood (1 Pet. iii. 21), with a bath (Ephes. v. 26, Tit. iii. 5), with a burial and resurrection (Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12). Finally, by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which

was always immersion (as it is to this day in the Oriental and also the Græco-Russian Churches); pouring and sprinkling being substituted only in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death." . . . "Respecting the form of baptism, therefore, the impartial historian is compelled by exegesis and history substantially to yield the point to the Baptists, as is done, in fact, by most German scholars—*e.g.*, Neander, Knapp; also by the Anglican divines, Conybeare and Howson."

REMARKS.

1. The early writers quoted knew of no baptism but that by immersion.

They compare it to a burial; they describe it as a going down into the water, a burial under it, and an emersion from it. They could use no stronger terms in describing immersion than they employed in speaking of baptism; and if their words do not set forth baptism as immersion, language can no longer convey any meaning.

2. Unauthorized additions were early made to the ordinance.

Such was the repetition of the act in trine immersion, and the custom of baptizing the candidates naked. Trine immersion probably began when controversies about the Trinity arose. At least some writers assign the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead as the reason why the candidates were thrice immersed, as did Tertullian and Jerome, and that is the reason given in the Apostolic Canons, Canon L. Others regarded trine immersion as more truly representing Christ's three days' burial than a single immersion, *e.g.*, Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius. A similar consideration and a restless uneasiness to improve upon the things of God, made them baptize people naked. "They thought it better represented (says Dr. Wall) the putting off the old man, and also the nakedness of Christ on the cross; moreover, as baptism is a washing, they judged it should be the washing of the body, not of the clothes. They took great care for preserving the modesty of any woman that was to be baptized. There was none but women that came near or in sight till she was undressed, and her body in the water. Then the priest came, and putting her head also under water, used the form of baptism. Then he departed, and the women took her out of the water, and clothed her again in white gar-

ments." (Dr. Wall's "History of Infant Baptism," vol. ii. p. 418, Oxford edition, 1835.) It was their tender feelings and misguided zeal that caused this; and rather than despise them, we ought, perhaps, to admire their enthusiasm, and their readiness to follow Jesus (as they understood His will), whatever self-denial it may have cost them.

There are several considerations which show that to immerse three times was a human modification of the ordinances.

(1.) There is no mention of such a practice in the New Testament.

Dr. Conant says that it "is clearly contrary to the words of the command. To justify such a practice, the form should have been either 'in the names of,' or 'in the name of the Father, in the name of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Spirit.'" When Naaman repeated the act, the repetition is recorded, just as we find the accounts in the early writers quoted; but we find no record of such a repetition in the New Testament.

(2.) There is no allusion to such a custom in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers who were contemporary with the Apostles, or in those of Justin Martyr.

(3.) The advocates of the practice did not claim Scriptural authority for it.

Jerome says:—"And if there were no authority of Scripture for it, the consent of the whole world would obtain the force of a precept. For many other things which are by tradition observed in the Church have obtained authority as if they were written laws; as, in the font of baptism, *ter caput mergitare*, to plunge the head *thrice* under water," &c. "The Scripture says, *Go ye, teach, and baptize*; and tradition adds, *Baptize by trine immersion*."—Basil (Robinson's "Hist. of Baptism," p. 63: and Dr. Wall's "Hist. of Inf. Bap.," vol. ii. pp. 219, 221). They defended it on the ground of tradition, as they defended other superstitious practices. The evidence for the meaning of *baptizo* is independent of trine immersion. The practice of the early Church, however, proves that it understood *baptizo* to denote immersion; it had no doubt as to that point; the question with it was, whether the act was to be repeated in the name of each person of the Trinity.

The history of the corruption of the ordinance, and of the rise of pouring or sprinkling, will come under consideration in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RISE OF POURING OR SPRINKLING.

As pouring is a mode of baptism not taught in the Scriptures, and against the meaning of the word used for the ordinance, it attracted attention at its rise, and protests were made against the innovation. The cause of its rise was the decline of spiritual religion in the churches. Men looked for salvation to the ordinances rather than to Christ. When the unbaptized were on the point of death, and as baptism was in their view essential to salvation, and it being dangerous to immerse men in the water when in a state of illness, the spiritual advisers of the people thought it better to pour water over and around the sick (so as to resemble immersion as nearly as possible under the circumstances), than to allow their souls to sink into perdition! From a similar motive they baptized infants, and gave communion to them. When submission to baptism is impossible, God surely takes the will for the deed, as He accepted David's readiness and desire to build the temple for the deed itself (2 Chron. vi. 8); in case of illness, the Lord approves of the desire of those that trust in Him to honour the ordinances of the Gospel, and His people ought to rest satisfied in that belief, rather than abuse His institution.

The first historical instance of pouring in baptism, (unless the mixture of oil and water poured on the head by the heretics written against by Irenæus, is to be considered such, as Dr. Gill thought, *Iren. Against Heresies*, B. I. chap. xxi. 4, Clark's ed.), is that of Novatian, about A.D. 251. When dangerously ill, he was *perfused* (περιχυθείς); water was poured over and around him, as he lay on his couch. He, however, recovered and was made a presbyter; but his appointment

was opposed by all the clergy and many of the laity, because his baptism was irregular. "Bishop Fabian ordained him presbyter, overlooking the circumstance that he had first made known his faith, and been baptized on his bed of sickness. The clergy of Rome were, from the first, discontented with this proceeding, because they maintained the letter of the old law of the Church, which was, that no man who was baptized on the bed of sickness, no 'clinicus' should be ordained" (Neander's "Church History," by Rose, vol. i. pp. 256, 257). Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, in opposition to whom Novatian had been chosen, wrote to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, that all the clergy, and a great many of the laity, were against his being ordained presbyter, because it was not lawful (they said) for anyone who had been perfused in his bed on account of sickness (τὸν ἐν κλινῇ διὰ νόσον περιχυθέντα) as he had been, to be admitted to any office of the clergy. In another part of his letter Cornelius says:—"Relieved by exorcists, he fell into an obstinate disease, and being supposed about to die, he *having been poured around* (περιχυθείς) on the bed where he lay, received [saving grace]; if indeed it be proper to say that such a man has received [it]." In the original, as preserved by Eusebius (περιχυθείς ἔλαβεν· εἰ γε χρὴ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι.—*Hist. Ecc. Lib. vi. 48*), the object of the verb is not expressed; he only says *having been sprinkled or poured around he received*, that is, *saving grace*, and not baptism, as the passage is generally rendered. He was perfused that his soul might be saved, as his friends deemed him to be on the point of death. Valesius, the learned Frenchman that edited the works of Eusebius, remarks on the passage, that "Ruffinus rightly translates the Greek word περιχυθείς *perfused*. For clinics, when they could not be immersed by the priests, were only perfused with water. Therefore, such baptism was held to be wanting in solemnity, and imperfect, because it seemed to be received, not voluntarily, but through fear of death, by persons delirious and destitute of perception. Moreover, *since baptism properly signifies immersion, such perfusion could hardly be called baptism.*" There were two objections, therefore, against admitting clinics into the ministry of the Word, namely, the doubt that existed as to the reality of their repentance, and the unscriptural manner of their baptism.

That the innovation of sprinkling agitated men's minds

appears also from Cyprian's answer to one Magnus: "You have inquired also, dearest son," said he, "what I think concerning those who in feebleness and languor obtain the grace of God, whether they are to be considered legitimate Christians, since they have not been bathed with the water, but perfused (*eo quod aqua saluari non loti sint, sed perfusi*). In which matter, my humble judgment does not deprive any one of his prerogative, so as to prevent him from deciding and acting according to his own convictions. I do, according to the best of my mean capacity, judge thus: that Divine favours are not maimed or weakened, so as that anything less than the whole of them is conveyed, where the benefit of them is received with full and complete faith both of the giver and receiver. . . . In the sacraments of salvation, when necessity compels, the shortest ways of transacting Divine matters (*divina compendia*) do, by God's gracious dispensation, confer on believers the whole benefit. And no man need, therefore, think otherwise, because these sick people, when they receive the grace of our Lord, have nothing but an affusion or sprinkling; whereas, the Holy Scripture, by the prophet Ezekiel, says, 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean,' &c." He also quotes to the same purpose Numb. viii. 7; xix. 13; see Clark's "Ante-Nicene Library. Cyprian's Writings," vol. i., Ep. 75; "Baptismal Tracts for the Times," pp. 52—58; and Dr. Wall's "History of Infant Baptism," vol. ii., pp. 385—389, whose translation I have, for the most part, followed.

The reader will draw the following inferences from the above quotation from Cyprian:—

1. That he could produce no Scriptural authority for sprinkling, but only give his own opinion on the subject. He does not pretend that it was baptism according to the command of Christ, but that it would do instead of immersion.

2. That it was in *cases of necessity* only that he defended and advocated it. But in cases of illness, the gracious Saviour will take the will for the deed, and He does not under any circumstances permit His people to corrupt His ordinances.

3. That he attributed the efficacy of the act to the faith both of the administrator and of the recipient of the ceremony.

4. That he deemed sprinkling as “a shorter way” of doing the will of God.

5. That the reason why he was so zealous for sprinkling water upon the sick was, that they might receive the saving grace of God.

6. That he believed that God would, in order that the sick might receive saving grace, allow men to change His ordinances!

7. That the quotation from Ezekiel is not to the point: for (1) The words do not refer to baptism, and are not the law of baptism. (2) Sprinkling is not baptism. (3) It was God that sprinkled this water, and not man.

Those that were thus sprinkled were called by way of derision “Clinics,” as *distinguished* from Christians. (*Cyprian’s 75th Epistle in Clark’s Ed. § 13.*) This practice of pouring water upon the sick was an exception to the general rule till the Council of Ravenna, held A.D. 1311, which declared “dipping or sprinkling” to be “indifferent.”

All divines and ecclesiastical historians bear out the statements made in this chapter in regard to the prevalence of immersion, and the rise of pouring or sprinkling.

From the whole it is evident,

1. That the belief that baptism was essential to salvation gave rise to sprinkling.

2. That pouring or sprinkling was not considered to be Scriptural, but deemed to be defective, since those that were only perfused were objected to as candidates for the ministry on that account.

3. That sprinkling as a mode of baptism is, therefore, *from men*. It began in error; it is founded upon superstition; it is destitute of Divine authority. When the absolute supremacy of God’s word in religious matters is restored, it must vanish away and disappear, like all the traditions of men (Matt. xv. 13).

CHAPTER IX.

THE ANCIENT BAPTISTERIES.

THE baptistery connected with a place of worship may convey some idea of the kind of baptism taught and administered there ; if it be large enough to admit of the total immersion of believers in it, it is inferred that the immersion of believers was the baptism recognized and practised in that place of worship at the time of its construction.

At first baptism was administered in rivers, lakes, pools, and baths. About the middle of the third century baptisteries began to be built near to places of worship. There were none *within* them until the sixth century. It is noticed as a remarkable fact that though there were several churches in the same city, yet with a few exceptions, there was but one baptistery in it.

Strictly speaking, the ancient baptisteries were capacious buildings, or *halls of baptism*, at first, for the most part octagonal, with a cupola roof, resembling the dome of a cathedral. They were built adjacent to the church or place of worship, but distinct from it. The middle part of such a building was one *large hall*, capable of containing a large multitude of people. As baptism was administered but once or twice a year, there were usually great multitudes to be baptized at the same time, which, together with the large number of spectators present, made it necessary to have a large hall and a large font for the occasion. In the centre of this great hall was an octagonal bath, or font, which was the baptistery proper, and from which the building derived its name. The sides of the building were parted off from the large hall in the middle, and divided into rooms, for the convenience

both of the administrator and the baptized, and for other purposes.

These halls of baptism were commonly called *Photisteria*, i.e., places of illumination, because those who were baptized were considered to have been instructed in the Christian faith. Justin Martyr, in the second century, made use of a similar language: "Now this bathing (*to loutron*) is called illumination (*photismos*), because they who learn the meaning of these things are enlightened in their mind." (*Apologia*, I., § 61.)

We shall now notice more particularly some of the ancient halls of baptism, with their baptisteries.

THE BAPTISTERY OF ST. JOHN LATERAN, ROME.

This is an octagonal building; the baptistery is in the middle of the floor, faced with marble, with three steps leading into it, and about thirty-seven inches in depth. It is said that it was at first deeper. This hall of baptism was originally a bath, in the house of Plautius Lateranus, a Roman consul; the Emperor Constantine gave the mansion to Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, as his residence, and the bath was turned into a baptistery. Some think that Constantine the Great himself was baptized in this baptistery, though others believe that he was baptized by Eusebius at Nicomedia, Asia Minor.

THE BAPTISTERY OF ST. SOPHIA, CONSTANTINOPLE.

Shortly after Constantine the Great embraced Christianity, he removed the seat of the Empire from Rome to Byzantium, which he called after his own name. Here, in the beginning of the fourth century, his Majesty built the splendid church of St. Sophia. Succeeding emperors greatly adorned and beautified it. It was in this that Chrysostom astonished and swayed the East with his eloquence; but it is now, alas! turned into a Mahometan temple. There is a large hall of baptism, or baptistery, connected with the Church of St. Sophia, which was called *Mega Photisterion*, i. e., The Great Place of Illumination. The baptistery proper was in the centre of the hall; it was supplied with water by means of pipes. There were several rooms near the font for the convenience of the catechumens and the minister.

THE BAPTISTERIES OF RAVENNA, ITALY.

There are two halls of baptism at Ravenna, one built by the Arians, the other by the Catholics. Both are octagonal buildings. In the Catholic Hall, built about A.D. 375, there is an octagonal room, about thirty-two feet square. In the centre of the room is a baptistery of white marble, about nine feet square. It is true that they do not immerse believers in this baptistery *now*, but sprinkle infants in another part of the hall, in a corner of the building; but at first, says the historian Ciampini, as quoted by R. Robinson, all were immersed in the baptistery proper, in the centre of the hall. In the cupola roof above the hall, there are many curious representations of Scripture characters and events.

THE BAPTISTERY OF VENICE.

In St. Mark's Square, at Venice, is St. Mark's Church, one of the most costly and splendid churches in the world. Connected with this church is a hall of baptism similar to those already referred to. It is adorned with many figures of mosaic work of the eighth or ninth century. The most noted representation in it is that of the baptism of Christ in the river Jordan. "In the middle the river Jordan (says Robinson) rolls along lashing the banks with its waves, and gurgling as it goes. In the river stands Jesus naked, the water nearly up to his shoulders. On the left hand stands John the Baptist, a tall thin man, his hair dishevelled, his beard not long but rough, habited in a short shaggy skin, over which a light cloak is thrown, the whole covering him only to the elbows and the knees. He is leaning toward the river, his left hand is just seen behind spread open and lifted up, and his right hand is on the head of Jesus, as if pressing him gently down into the water, while Jesus seems to be yielding to the water under the hand of John. Behind John, more to the left, lies a double axe at the foot of a tree, an allusion probably to his own words, *the axe is laid to the root of the trees*. On the right hand side of the piece, on the banks of the Jordan, over against John, are three angels with wings to their shoulders, and garments down to their feet, bowing with all submission to Jesus Christ. Above, the heavens open, a star sparkles, and the dove descends. In the river the fish are seen sporting, and the

river god, in a human form, is regaling himself like a joyous youth in a bath. By these emblems the artist intended to express that the whole world, rivers and animals, and all nature rejoiced at the advent of Jesus. At the top of the piece, in the left hand corner, are these words: THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST."

THE BAPTISTERY OF FLORENCE.

There are several baths in the hall of baptism at Florence, in which large multitudes were baptized by immersion at Easter. Michael Angelo was so struck by the beauty of its gates, and so enraptured with their bas-reliefs, that he exclaimed that they were deserving to be the portals of Paradise.

Many other baptisteries might be mentioned, such as that connected with the cathedral of Milan, where, by-the-bye, the ancient practice of immersion has been continued to this day; that belonging to the Notre-Dame, Paris, in which King Clovis was immersed in the beginning of the sixth century; that at Pisa, which is a circular building of white marble, 115 feet in diameter, and 172 in height, often called "The Glory of Pisa," in the centre of which is a font, from three to four feet in depth; and that of Parma, whose font was made of marble, and is four feet deep, and five or six in diameter.

A few years ago, there was a large baptistery at St. Peter's Church, Oxford, that was eleven feet in circumference, and of proportionate depth. Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth were both, when infants, three times immersed in a font.

The impartial reader must be convinced that the ancient baptisteries were made for baptism by immersion. As to England, it was the learned Assembly of Divines at Westminster, by their "Directory for the Public Worship of God," 1644, says Wall, that "reformed the font into a basin," in this kingdom, in defiance of all antiquity!

"Ni bu yn hir neb yn hel,
Y cwpan a'r dwr i'r capel."

See Robinson's *History of Baptism*, and Dr. Cote's *Archæology of Baptism*, in both of which are several engravings of ancient baptisteries, Duncan's *History of the Baptists*, Coleman's *Christian Antiquities*, and the *Encyclopædias*.

CHAPTER X.

BAPTISM IN THE GREEK AND ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

IT was on the 16th of July, A.D. 1054, that the Greek Church became finally and wholly separated from the Latin or Western Church. A misunderstanding began to exist between them as early as the year A.D. 197, in respect to the observance of Easter. Various causes contributed to its continuance and its bitterness, till it culminated in the act of the legates of Pope Leo IX., on behalf of the Pope, excommunicating Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the church of St. Sophia, Constantinople, on the day referred to. Since that time many efforts have been made to unite the two communities, but in vain. The numbers of the adherents of the different branches of the Greek Church are estimated as follows:—

In Russia	50,000,000
In Turkey	12,000,000
In Greece	800,000
In Austria	2,800,000
In the Patriarchate of Alexandria	5,000
” ” Antioch	150,000
” ” Jerusalem	15,000
In all about	65,770,000

The Greek Church, for the most part, uses the Scriptures in the Greek language; in Greek are its principal works written, and its doctrines defined, and ceremonies taught. To the Greek Church belonged Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzen, John of Damascus,

Theophylact, and several other well-known names to every historian and divine. As we have adduced in a previous chapter ("Baptism in the Primitive Church"), the testimony of some of the earlier of these writers, we shall not here refer but to two of them.

John of Damascus, born about the end of the seventh century, in a work entitled "The Orthodox Faith," Book iv., chap. 9, says:—"For baptism shows the Lord's death. We are indeed buried (*sunthaptometha*) with the Lord by means of baptism, as says the holy Apostle." Also in another place:—"Israel, if he had not passed through the sea, would not have been delivered from Pharaoh; and thou, if thou pass not through the water (*parellhês dia tou hudatos*), wilt not be delivered from the tyranny of the devil."

Theophylact, Archbishop of Achrida, Bulgaria, about the middle of the eleventh century, made, among several others, the following allusions to baptism:—"The Church has been taught to baptize with invocation of the Trinity, and to symbolize the Lord's death and resurrection by the threefold sinking down and coming up (*tê trisse katadusei kai anadusei*)." "We also are ourselves baptized, imitating death by the sinking down, and resurrection by the coming up." "He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit. That is, He will deluge you ungrudgingly (*kataklusei humas aphthonôs*), with the graces of the Spirit."

The change in the mode of baptism, introduced by the Roman Church, was an offence to the Greek branch from the beginning, and a stumbling block in the way of union between the Oriental and Occidental sections. In the bull of Leo IX. excommunicating Michael Cerularius, it is complained that the Greek Church did not acknowledge the baptism of others as valid. When Pope Eugene IV., in 1439, sought to unite the two Churches, Mark of Ephesus opposed the union, alleging, among other reasons, that the baptism of the Latins was entirely different from that of the Greeks.

Immersion is the mode of baptism in the Greek Church to this day. In the "Ritual of the Greeks," called "Euchologion," we have the following direction:—

"And when the whole body is anointed, the priest baptizes him (*i e.*, the child), holding him erect, and looking towards the east, saying, The servant of God (naming the child) is baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of

the Holy Ghost, now and ever, and for the ages of ages, Amen. At each invocation, sinking him and raising him (*katagôn auton kai anagôn*)," &c.

In a work called the "Pedalion," a folio of 484 pages, the standard work of the Greek Church for its faith and ordinances, the following remarks occur:—

"We say that the baptism of the Latins is *baptism falsely named*." "The Latins are heretics of old, specially from the fact that they are unbaptized (*abaptistoi*)."
"Observe that we do not say that we re-baptize (*anabaptizomen*) the Latins, but that we baptize them, since their baptism is a lie in its very name."
"It is not baptism at all, but bare sprinkling (*rantisma*)."
(Duncan's "History of the Baptists," p. 200.)

In the year 1816, Alexander de Stourdza, a distinguished member of the Greek Church, published a volume in French, entitled, "Considerations on the Doctrine and Spirit of the Orthodox (Greek) Church." The following passage occurs in it:—

"The distinctive character of the institution of baptism, then is, *immersion* βάπτισμα (*baptisma*), which cannot be omitted without destroying the mysterious meaning of the sacrament, and without contradicting, at the same time, the etymological signification of the word which serves to designate it. The Western (Romish) Church, therefore, has separated from the imitation of Jesus Christ; she has caused all the sublimity of the external sign to disappear; in short, she is guilty of an abuse of words and of ideas in practising *baptism by aspersion*, the mere announcement of which is a laughable contradiction. In point of fact, the verb βάπτίζω (*baptizo*)—*immergo*—has only one signification. Literally and always, it means to *plunge*. Baptism and immersion, therefore, are identical; and to speak of *baptism by aspersion* is the same as if one should say *immersion by aspersion*."

The members of the Greek Church are accustomed, says Moses Stuart in his "Essay on the Mode of Baptism," to call the members of the Western Churches "*sprinkled Christians*," by way of ridicule and contempt. "The Greek Church, in all the branches of it (says Dr. Wall), does still use immersion; and they hardly count a child, except in case of sickness, (?) well baptized without it. And so do all other Christians in the world, except the Latins. That which I

hinted before is a rule that does not fail in any particular that I know of, viz., all those nations of Christians that do now, or formerly did, submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling. And though the English received not this custom till after the decay of Popery, yet they have since received it from such neighbour-nations as had begun it in the time of the Pope's power. But all other Christians in the world, who never owned the Pope's usurped power, do, and ever did, dip their infants in the ordinary use." (Wall's "History of Infant Baptism," vol. ii., p. 414.) It is often said that the Greek Church acknowledges the validity of sprinkling by admitting members of other communities without immersing them. Such an assertion must be received with important qualification. The testimonies we have adduced are decisive that the orthodox Greek Church cannot regard it so. The following item from an American paper, quoted in the *Freeman* for April 2, leads to the same conclusion:—"We understand from the Rev. Mr. Doyen, missionary returned from Japan, that the Church of England Society, represented in Yeddo by Revs. Messrs. Wright and Jameson, has ordered, that hereafter all converts joining that denomination shall be *immersed*. The Board passed the resolution on the ground that *the Greek Church, now most successfully labouring in Japan, refused to acknowledge sprinkling as baptism*. Mr. Wright has quite recently immersed two converts in conformity to these orders."

Dr. Cramp, of Acadia College, Nova Scotia, in a letter to the *Freeman*, dated Nov. 13, 1866, has set this matter in a clear light. Quoting extracts from a letter written by the Rev. Dr. Arnold, for many years a missionary in Greece, he proves several points in regard to baptism in the Greek Church. (1) In the *Neon Pedulion* published at Athens in 1841, one of the most important ecclesiastical books of the Greek Church, "pouring and sprinkling are repeatedly characterized as *pseudo-baptism*." (2) When Pius IX., soon after his accession to the papal chair, sent a circular to the Eastern Christians, inviting them to return to the Catholic faith, the Patriarch of Constantinople convened a synod, in which an Encyclical Letter was drawn and adopted, which was afterwards printed in Greek at Corfu, in 1848. In that document the practice of the Roman Church in baptism

is said to be "a departure from the apostolic form"; "a substitution of sprinkling instead of baptism;" and "a making superfluous the baptism which the Lord delivered to the Church." (3) Dr. Arnold explains that *in the Russian branch of the Greek Church, members of the Roman Catholic Church are admitted without being baptized*: but that in the Greek Church proper they are not so admitted. This is illustrated by the account of the refusal of the Patriarch of Constantinople, on the 8th of October, 1851, to receive into the Greek Church the Rev. William Palmer, clergyman of the Church of England, and brother of Lord Selborne, unless he submitted to be immersed, which he declined, and entered the Romish Church. The Russian branch of the Greek Church, however, though admitting converts without re-baptizing them, is most scrupulous in her adherence to her own practice of immersion.

As to the Eastern Churches in general, we learn that the *Nestorians*, the *Armenians*, the *Abyssinians*, and all the others who have not bowed the knee to Rome, baptize by immersion. "They all administer baptism by immersion," says Robinson, "and there is no instance of the contrary." See Dwight and Smith's "Missionary Researches in Armenia," pp. 305, 382; Robinson's "Hist. of Baptism," pp. 484, 499; Wall's "Hist. of Baptism," "The Greek and Eastern Churches," by R. T. S., p. 86; Ricaut's "Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches," pp. 168, 169, 432, and Dr. Cotes's recent volume on "The Archæology of Baptism." Some writers, however, affirm that sprinkling and dipping are joined in the baptism of some of these communities. Dr. Arnold, in the communication already alluded to, testifies what I myself have been led to believe, namely that such assertions must have been mistakes on the part of eye-witnesses and others, in regarding one of the numerous accompanying ceremonies as part of the baptism itself. Casual visitors to their places of worship, through ignorance of their languages and their numerous ceremonies, might easily fall into such error.

The bearing of this article on the question under consideration is this, that the Greeks understand their own language; that *baptizo* in their judgment in every age means to immerse or overwhelm; that this consideration, together with the fact that the Greek Church has from the beginning

till now practised immersion, is a strong proof that immersion only is the true mode of baptism. It shows also that the sprinkling of infants is one of those corruptions which have been introduced by the Church of Rome into the Christian world.

CHAPTER XI.

OBJECTIONS—A BRIEF REVIEW OF DR. HALLEY'S WORK ON BAPTISM.

HAVING already obviated and answered by anticipation several objections to the view that immersion only is the Scriptural mode of baptism, I shall notice other objections by way of offering a few remarks on Dr. Halley's able work on the Sacraments, as they occurred to me in reading his lectures on Baptism. In this article I shall, of course, confine my observations to his lectures on the mode of Baptism only. Nor do I profess to notice everything that I deemed erroneous in his reasoning, or inaccurate and unsound in his criticism ; but some of those considerations that are generally adduced against baptism by immersion.

CONSCIENCE AS A GUIDE IN RELIGIOUS MATTERS.

Dr. Halley gives undue prominence to conscientiousness in religious matters, as if man's conscientiousness were as acceptable to God as enlightened piety :—" If I observe what I believe to be Christian Baptism, even though I may be mistaken, that observance is to me an act of submission to the legislation of Christ." (" The Sacraments," Part I., pp. 234, 235, ed. 1854.) In the absence of Revelation, it is well for men like Simmias (Plato's " *Phaedo*," ch. 35), to hope for the best and venture on the most probable supposition, and be conscientious ; but when the Word of God is in one's hands, the first thing for him is to ascertain the meaning of that, and then sincerely follow its teaching, and not stifle or renounce inquiry on the ground that he is perfectly conscientious in acting as he does, whether right or wrong.

CELEBRATING THE LORD'S SUPPER WITH WATER.

In the case of total abstainers and the inhabitants of cold countries in which the vine does not grow, Dr. Halley thinks that wine might be dispensed with ; in regard to the inhabitants of Iceland, for instance, he agrees with Moses Stuart that the Lord's Supper might be appropriately celebrated with fish and water (pp. 237, 250). I have little to say of this hypothetical kind of reasoning, only that I myself would shrink from altering the command of Christ ; and if bread and wine could not be obtained, I for one would seek to commune with Him by faith, and wait, without commemorating His death by means of visible symbols and an outward act, till I could do so according to His command, firmly believing that He would respect my scruples much more than approve of my presumption in altering His ordinance. In like manner, I should prefer to delay baptism till sufficient water for immersion could be obtained, to having recourse to sprinkling in defiance of the command of Christ. The inhabitants of cold regions are as able to undergo immersion as those of hot climates.

THE APOSTLE PAUL ON BAPTISM.

Dr. Halley believes that " Paul, were he now living upon earth, would not think it worth his while to decide the question between the immersionists and the sprinklers." He would say according to our author, " He that immerseth, immerseth unto the Lord, and he that sprinkleth, sprinkleth unto the Lord " (pp. 238, 240). There was a reason for Paul's kind forbearance towards those that were weak in the faith, for *God has instituted the rites of the old covenant*, and some of the Jewish believers could not feel persuaded that God had also abolished them ; but God never established infant sprinkling, and the cases, therefore, are not parallel. Paul would doubtless say the same thing respecting baptism that he did when alive, for his word was not yea yea, and nay nay (2 Cor. i. 18). He spoke of it and still speaks of it as *burial* with Christ (Rom. vi. 4).

PHYLACTERIES.

Dr. Halley says that there was a positive command about wearing phylacteries ; but as Christ did not keep it, therefore it is inferred that it is not important for us to keep God's

positive commands according to the letter (pp. 243, 244). It is more probable, however, as several commentators suppose, that the Pharisees took in a literal sense what was to be figuratively understood ; so that an objection raised from a questionable interpretation of a passage cannot be of much force. The custom of wearing phylacteries is supposed to have begun after the captivity, and the Saviour could not be expected to give His sanction to what was grounded on error and superstition. He especially condemned the *motive* of the Pharisees in all their religious observances (Matt. vi. 1—6 ; xxiii. 5).

THE HOLY KISS.

The Doctor says that this is a positive precept, enjoined by apostolical authority, and is surprised that Baptists disregard a positive command in this matter, while so zealous for it in baptism (pp. 244, 245). But one sin does not justify man in committing another. It is a matter of regret that so eminent a divine should place a Divine ordinance—submitted to by the Son of God, which is to be administered in the name of the Trinity, and is emblematic of the great facts of redemption—on an equality with the details mentioned in Paul's Epistles, respecting the common courtesy of the brethren towards each other, amounting in reality to no more than *greet one another with cordiality* ! The words may be meant, however, not as a command, but as a caution against abuse—that the usual salutation amongst them should be of a pure and holy nature, and not of a sensual and an unholy tendency. (See Bengel on Rom. xvi. 16.)

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

Dr. Halley says that the followers of Christ are commanded to repeat the Lord's Prayer in their public devotion, adding that every argument the Baptists " adduce in defence of their departure from the form of prayer will tell with equal force against their exclusive practice of immersion " (p. 246). Not so ; for (1) By giving another direction to pray in His name (John xvi. 23, 24), Christ virtually withdrew the Lord's Prayer as a form—that is, supposing it was ever intended as such, which I do not believe.

(2.) The form and words differ in the different Evangelists ; but the command to baptize does not differ in them ; it is not to immerse in one, and to sprinkle in another.

(3.) We have no record that the Apostles used the form of the Lord's Prayer; but we read in the Acts, and learn from the Epistles, that they practised the ordinance of baptism according to the command of Christ.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The term used for supper in the New Testament denotes, says our author, "a meal, so much food as is sufficient to refresh the body"; but in communion we use but a small quantity, and yet this is called "the supper;" why, then, may not a small quantity of water do in baptism (p. 249)? There are, however, two or three considerations that show the weakness of this reasoning:

(1.) The Lord's Supper was instituted probably after the supper of the Passover, which shows that it was not intended to satisfy man's bodily wants.

(2.) When the Corinthians mistook the design of it, Paul taught them that they were to satisfy their bodily wants at home, and not at the Lord's table.

(3.) The supper was intended to direct the mind to spiritual things, and the act of breaking the bread and of pouring the wine, and the participation of the same, did that to the spiritually-minded, independently of the quantity.

There are no such intimations given respecting baptism as would lead us to think that only a small quantity of water is to be used in the administration of it. The very design of it shows that immersion is essential to the act, in order to image forth the burial and resurrection of Christ, and our burial in regard to the old life of sin, and our resurrection to a life of holiness.

BAPTISM A BURIAL.

Dr. Halley smiles at our weakness in saying that baptism represents *a burial*, and intimates that those who maintain that view do not understand Eastern customs (pp. 261, 262). Possibly Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem in the fourth century, may be regarded as understanding Eastern customs as well as an independent minister in England in the 19th century. He speaks on this question thus: "For as Jesus assuming the sin of the world died, that having slain sin He might raise thee up in righteousness: so also thou going down into the water, and in a manner *buried in the waters as He in the rock*,

art raised again, walking in newness of life." In whatever manner the bodies of the dead were deposited in tombs, they were buried and hid under the surface of the earth, as the baptized are momentarily buried and hid under water in baptism. Nor was the ancient custom of burying the dead so entirely discontinued in Italy in the Apostolic age, as to render the words of Paul in comparing baptism to a burial meaningless to the Romans. (See Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of Antiquities," art. "Funus.") Other Pædobaptist authors have understood the words of Paul in Rom. vi. 4, as teaching immersion and burial with Christ; such as Dr. Hammond, Grotius, Tillotson, Whitby, Doddridge, Wesley, Chalmers, Tholuck, and Conybeare and Howson. So the Latin Fathers understood them, and the recent Italian convert, Canon Paolo Grassi, as seen in his celebrated letter of September 28, 1873, to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome.

GREEK PREPOSITIONS.

Dr. Halley adopts the principle of explaining the meaning of a verb from a possible meaning of a preposition construed with it. Thus, as *baptizo* is construed with *ἐν* and as *ἐν* sometimes means *with*, therefore *baptizo ἐν* should be rendered *baptize with* (p. 325). The first and natural meaning of *ἐν*, however, is *in, within*; and if it does not denote that, the Greek language cannot convey that idea. When a preposition admits of several meanings, the safer way would be to adopt the meaning most suitable to the verb. In such a construction as to "smite with (*ἐν*) the sword," or "kill with (*ἐν*) sword" (Luke xxii. 49; Rev. vi. 8), the preposition denotes the instrument whereby the act is done, and is properly rendered *with*; but in such constructions as to "sow in (*ἐν*) the field," "hide in (*ἐν*) a field" (Matt. xiii. 31, 44), "lay in (*ἐν*) a manger" (Luke ii. 7), "lay in a sepulchre" (Mark xv. 46; Luke xxiii. 53), the sense of *with* would be inadmissible. We maintain that the sense of "*with*" is inappropriate also with *baptizo*, since the natural and usual meaning of that verb is to *immerse*, so that the words of John the Baptist—*baptizo ἐν ὕδατι*—must mean I baptize *in water* (Matt. iii. 11; John i. 31, 32). So also in regard to the dative (*ἡδατι*) after *baptizo*; it is the dative of place, denoting the *element in which* baptism was administered, and not the dative of instrument, and should be rendered *in water*.

(See B. W. Noel's "Essay on the Act of Baptism," pp. 16—27.)

Dr. Halley allows that *baptizo eis*—*baptize into*—denotes *to immerse into* (pp. 324, 325). This is the construction in Mark i. 9, where it is said that Christ "was baptized into the Jordan"; compare to "plunge into (*baptizo eis*) the sea," and "into the Lake Copias," by Plutarch (Conant's "Baptizein," Examples 64, 65). The construction in Matt. iii. 6 is "to baptize in (*ἐν*) the Jordan." In the edition of 1844 of Dr. Halley's "Lectures," the following remark on the baptism of Christ occurs: "I have no wish to deny that in the instance of our Lord, John baptized into the Jordan. In some instances, and in this, immersion might have been the most convenient mode." In the edition of 1854 the concession has disappeared! We find a similar difference between the earlier and later editions of Dr. Robinson's Greek Lexicon. It would be interesting to know on what principle this difference is to be accounted for.

"To baptize into," in other connections, ought to cause no difficulty; it denotes the *moral end in view* in baptism, when the baptized engages to follow and obey Christ, and renounce the flesh with its lusts (Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27; Matt. xxviii. 19).

That I may not recur to this subject again, I will add another word. Moses Stuart, in remarking upon Matt. iii. 16, says that *anabaino*, the verb used for *going up*, cannot mean to *emerge* from the water; and that *apo*, the preposition in construction with it, cannot indicate a movement *out of* a liquid. Matthew Henry also makes use of a similar language. As to the Greek preposition *apo*, it may be stated that the general meaning of it is *from, away from*; but it means also frequently *out from, out of*, as in Matt. iii. 16. When it is said that unclean spirits go *out of* (*apo*) a man (Matt. xii. 43, xvii. 18), and that evil thoughts proceed *out of* (*apo*) the heart (Mark vii. 15); that Peter descended *out of* (*apo*) the ship (Matt. xiv. 29), that the chief priests pretended to judge Christ on account of what proceeded *out of* (*apo*) His own mouth (Luke xxii. 7), and that the mote is cast *out of* (*apo*) the eye (Matt. vii. 4), it is evident that the word *apo* may denote *out of* the water in Matt. iii. 16. The fact is, the prepositions *apo*=*from*, and *ek*=*out of*, are frequently used interchangeably, probably

because the former, being the more general, includes the latter: *e. g.*, Matt. vii. 4, compared with verse 5, and Luke iv. 35, where both are used in the same sense. The verb *anabaino*, *to go up*, occurring in Matt. iii. 16, is used in Matt. xvii. 27, to describe the act of a fish emerging and rising to the hook; and in Rev. xiii., to describe a beast coming out of the sea. That the preposition *apo* may denote a movement *out of* a liquid, is clear from the Greek Septuagint, Tobit vi. 2: "And the boy went down to wash himself, and a fish leaped from the river (*ἔνεπιδήσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*), and would have swallowed him."

There are several things that prove that *apo* must mean *out of* in Matt. iii. 16:—(1.) The meaning of the word *baptizo*, which is *to immerse*. (2.) The preposition *en*, *in*, or *eis*, *into*, construed with *baptizo*, which shows that Christ was baptized in or plunged into the river. Compare Matt. iii. with Mark i. 9. (3.) The corresponding phrase in Acts viii. 39, where *ek*, *out of*, is used.

It is a dangerous rule of interpretation to assert that because a preposition is used in a certain sense in one connection, it must have the same meaning everywhere: the true meaning is that which best harmonizes with the context, and with the construction in which such word occurs.

In Acts viii. 9, we read of Philip and the Eunuch coming up *out of the water* (*ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος*). Professor Godwin informs his readers that the words "may be rendered, with perfect propriety, *from the water*," and do not imply that the persons went at all into the water, still less that they went into deep water ("Christian Baptism," p. 95). The same reasoning would go to prove that Noah never entered into the ark, that Jonah was not cast into the sea, and that the Redeemer has not entered heaven. According to his way of interpreting Scripture, the Word of God may be forced to mean anything a writer may desire! Moses Stuart, in his "Essay on Baptism," says that *ek* is the proper word to indicate a movement out of a liquid into the air; and we may add that the Greeks knew of no stronger term to convey that meaning.

The objections raised from trine immersion, Jewish ablutions, and the scarcity of water in Jerusalem, &c., have been noticed in previous chapters.

CHAPTER XII.

OBJECTIONS BY DR. HALLEY AND OTHERS.

In this chapter I shall briefly refer to other objections against baptism by immersion.

THE MODESTY OF EASTERN WOMEN.

“Let any one (says Dr. Halley) consider the habits of Oriental women, concealed rather than adorned with their veils, and then resolve the inquiry, whether it is probable that the women of Judea, exposed to the gaze of promiscuous crowds, would submit to be immersed in the Jordan by John the Baptist. It is to me incredible that Jewish women resorted to a public immersion, and none the less so, because immersion in private, with so much care and circumspection, was practised on the admission of female proselytes to the privileges of their nation.” “Halley on the Sacraments,” pp. 315, 316. In regard to this, we observe:—

(1.) That the meaning of *baptizo* is to *immerse*, and objections from supposed difficulties cannot do away with the evidence adduced to prove that it is such.

(2.) Women were baptized in the apostolic age, and were consequently immersed.

(3.) That the inference drawn from Jewish proselyte baptism is not to the point, as Jewish proselyte baptism cannot be proved to have existed till some centuries after Christ. See the first chapter.

(4.) That whatever may have been the modesty of female converts in the apostolic age, it is very probable, if not certain, that Indian women are as modest and of as secluded habits as the women of Judea, Greece, or Asia Minor ever were.

The late Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, M.A., in his essay

on "The External Act of Baptism," pp. 81—84, furnished several instances of women immersing themselves at the sacred festivals of the Hindoos. I find the following instance also in an extract from Mr. Chamberlain's journal, inserted in Dr. Cox's "History of the Baptist Mission," vol. i. p. 113 :—" *Gunga Saugur*.—Here we saw the works of idolatry and blind superstition. Crowds upon crowds of infatuated men, women, and children, high and low, young and old, rich and poor, *bathing in the water*, and worshipping Gunga," &c. Our excellent missionary, the Rev. Thomas Evans, Allahabad, wrote a note to me when he was last in this country, from which I make the following quotation :—" Built, October 28, 1874. Immersions in India are *daily* occurrences. The people who live near to any of the great rivers resort thither every morning, and it is there on the banks of the rivers we go to preach to them in the morning. There is a perfect medley of them, men, women, and children all mixed up together, without the least idea of anything like impropriety. In fact, the whole thing is conducted in such a decent manner that there is no impropriety about it. All the adults go down into the river with more or less covering on ; after they bathe—which they always do by dipping the whole body three times under water—they come to the bank, dexterously throw over themselves a clean under-garment, and drop from under it the wet vesture to the ground, which they wash after completing their toilet. I have often looked on with wonder at some hundreds of men, women, and children, all mixed up and changing their garments without the slightest improper exposure, or any sign of confusion or indecency. They are quite expert at this sort of thing, and can do it far better than we could. You will see from this that there is no force whatever in the argument of our friends who say that *promiscuous* immersions would be indecent ; only let such visit the East, and they will soon see that such is not the case."

Lieutenant Lynch, of the United States, describes the advance of an army of pilgrims to the Jordan thus :—"In all the wild haste of a disorderly rout, Copts and Russians, Poles, Armenians, Greeks, and Syrians, from all parts of Asia, from Europe, from Africa, and from far distant America, on they came ; men, women, and children, of every age and hue, and in every variety of costume ; talking, screaming, shouting, in almost every known language under the sun. They hur-

ried eagerly forward, and dismounting in haste and disrobing with precipitation, rushed down the bank and threw themselves into the stream. They seemed to be absorbed with one impulsive feeling, and *perfectly regardless of the observations of others*. Each one plunged himself, or was dipped by another, three times, in honour of the Trinity; and then filled a bottle, or some other utensil, from the river. The bathing-dress of many of the pilgrims was a white gown with a black cross upon it." ("Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea," p. 168.) We see, then, that the objection from the modesty of Oriental women is groundless, for in matters of conscience and religion they are as bold and courageous as the men; and in the days of Christ and His Apostles they came forward to be buried with their Lord in baptism with the same alacrity as believers of the other sex.

ECCLESIASTICAL BAPTISM.

Dr. Halley says that "Ecclesiastical writers admit Christian baptism to have been valid, in which there was no immersion," and that Cyprian calls perfusion "the baptism of the Church." This, however, amounts to no more than what Baptists sometimes do in calling infant sprinkling *infant baptism*, simply for convenience' sake, because many regard it as such, and not because they themselves regard sprinkling to be the right mode of baptism. Cyprian himself speaks of sprinkling as "a shorter way" of doing the will of God than the one He Himself prescribed, as I have already shown. As to Cyprian calling sprinkling the "baptism of the Church," that is a proof against it, rather than in its favour: it was the baptism of the Church *as having been instituted by men*, and not by Christ, and as contrasted with the baptism taught in the New Testament (Cyprian's "Epistle to Magnus"). However they regarded it, the inspired record is our rule.

Dr. Halley insists on taking such passages as refer to overwhelming afflictions and suffering in the literal sense, such as baptisms by blood and by tears (which figures the writers justify by referring to the words of Christ, Matt. xx. 22), in order to weaken the force of the arguments for baptism by immersion; no impartial reader, however, will put much confidence in such reasoning.

HEATHEN LUSTRATIONS.

It is said by Dr. Halley and others that sprinklings were practised by the heathen in imitation of Christian baptism, and that immersion, consequently, is not necessarily the only mode of baptism. I observe upon this objection (1), That there is such ambiguity in some of the passages appealed to as bearing out the above assertion that they are not a decisive evidence in the matter. Clement of Alexandria, to whom Dr. Halley refers as proving his statement, for example, refers in the paragraph alluded to, to several ceremonies, and immersion may be intended by him when speaking of baptism. Thus: "It is said that we ought to go *bathed* (λελουμένους) to sacrifices and prayers," in which the reference must be to immersion. Again: "It was the custom of the Jews to baptize themselves (βαπτίζεσθαι) frequently on account of the bed," alluding to the different immersions under the law after contracting defilement. Further: "Be pure, not *by means of bathing* (λουτρά) but in mind" (Stromata, B. iv.). Clement himself distinguishes between the purifications (τὰ καθάρσια) of the Greeks, and the *bath* or *laver* (τὸ λουτρόν) of the Barbarians; which bath or bathing must refer to the practice of immersion among the heathen, or to baptism by immersion among the Christians (Stromata, B. v.).

(2.) It is assumed, without proof, that they were imitations of Christian baptism. Clement of Alexandria says expressly in the paragraph alluded to by Dr. Halley that it was from Moses that they had derived their rites. Justin Martyr, in his "Apology" (i. § 62), speaks of the heathen imitating the rites of the Old Testament, rather than the ordinances of the New. The same may be said of Tertullian. In the Oxford edition of the "Library of the Fathers," Tertullian, Vol. I., p. 260, Rev. C. Dodgson, M.A., the translator, makes the following remark on De Baptismo, chap. v., "Tertullian looking upon the heathen rites as copied from the Jewish (as doubtless they were, in as far as they were not the expressions of nature itself), and so anticipations of the Christian sacraments," etc.

(3.) The facts of the case are not always fairly placed before the reader. The following representations by Dr. Halley, for example, are stronger than the facts justify. "Clement of Alexandria represents the custom among the heathen of wash-

ing before prayer as a figure of baptism, citing from Homer the verses respecting Penelope sprinkling herself, and Telemachus washing his hands" (p. 338). Homer, however, does not say that Penelope sprinkled herself. The line which Clement cites is from "The Odyssey," Book xvii. 48 :

"And she having bathed (*ὑδρηναμένην*), and wearing on her body clean clothes." Liddell and Scott's "Lexicon" gives *to bathe* as the first meaning of the verb *ὑδραίνω* (*hudraino*) in the Middle Voice, in which form it is used by Homer and quoted by Clement (Strom. B. iv.). After purifying herself by taking a bath, the change of garments follows naturally. How Telemachus's washing his hands could be a figure of Christian baptism is too profound a mystery for me! The point discussed by Clement is the necessity of having a pure mind before engaging in the service of God, which duty the heathen poets also, said he, had learnt from Moses; hence the various purifications and ablutions of the Jews and the heathen before they entered their respective temples.

He may have referred to what he supposed to be a similar preparation of mind before worship among the heathen and God's people, when he spoke of the "image of baptism," *without having reference to the action at all*, and the nature of his subject and the context render this supposition probable. We find writers speak of the similarity of inward preparation or the identity of spiritual results when the action was different in the cases alluded to: for example, Cyprian says that perfusion is of like value with the saving bath, when the faith of the administrator and that of the candidate is the same as that required in immersion.

Dr. Halley writes in regard to Justin Martyr as follows:—

"Justin Martyr contends that from the prophecies of the true baptism, the worshippers in the heathen temples were taught by demons to sprinkle themselves with water before they made their offerings" (p. 338). What Justin wrote is this: "And the dæmons hearing of this bathing (*λουτρὸν*) which was taught by the prophet, instigated those who enter into their temples, and who are about to come before them, paying drink offerings and burnt offerings, also to sprinkle themselves; and they cause men to go and *bathe the whole person* (*τέλεον λούεσθαι*) before they come to the temples in which they are enshrined. And the command given by the priests to those who enter the temples

and worship in them, to put off their shoes, the devils have learnt and imitated from what happened to Moses," etc. (Apologia, I., § 62.) The preceding quotation refutes Dr. Halley's assertion; and proves that *the imitations here alluded to were imitations of the rites of the law*, and not of Christian baptism. There were (1) Offerings, as under the law. (2) Sprinkling: comp. Num. xix. 13. (3) Bathing of the whole body: comp. Num. xix. 19; Lev. xv. 5. (4) The putting off of the shoes: comp. Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15. Moreover, Justin does not say that the heathen worshippers sprinkled themselves *with water*; that is Dr. Halley's addition; it might be sprinkling *with blood*, for aught Justin says. The sprinkling referred to was but *one* out of several customs said to be borrowed from the service of God. If there was an imitation of Christian baptism at all among the heathen, it was the *bathing* or the *immersion of the whole body*, alluded to in the above quotation; for Justin knew of no other baptism, and he would not have compared sprinkling to what he himself taught was immersion. On the other hand, it deserves consideration whether the custom of sprinkling water in the Christian Church may not be traced to a heathen source.

THE INFLUENCE OF THREE HUNDRED YEARS.

Dr. Halley writes in regard to the points just discussed:—"If, in the language of the three centuries immediately after the giving of the commission, 'baptize all nations,' the words did not mean immerse all nations, we ought to hesitate, nineteen centuries afterwards, before we impose that sense upon them" (p. 329). In reply, we notice:—(1) That the words *did* mean that, as we have proved in the previous chapters; and Cyprian and others did not attempt to defend sprinkling on the ground of its being the command of Christ, but on the supposition that, by God's permission, it would do instead of immersion in the case of the sick.

(2.) Dr. Halley's reasoning would support infant communion on the same ground as sprinkling. If 300 years after the institution of the Lord's Supper, the words of Christ in the estimation of Christian teachers did not exclude infants from the Lord's table, we ought to hesitate nineteen centuries afterwards before we affirm that they do so! And so in regard to many other superstitions. We must abide

by the truth, and not follow the fathers ; for many of them gloried in innovations, and eclipsed the glory and weakened the power of the Gospel by their human additions.

THE PHRASE "MUCH WATER" IN JOHN III. 23.

Prof. Godwin is of the opinion that *hulata polla* in John iii. 23, means "many streams, rather than one large collection of water." The fact, however, is that the phrase is a Hebraism, used only in the New Testament by John for the Hebrew מים רבים, *maim rabbim*, always in the plural in Hebrew, and denotes *much water* ; it is used in the LXX in 2 Sam. xxii. 17 ; Psalm xviii. 16 ; xxxii. 6 ; xciii. 4 ; cvii. 23 (corresponding to the word *sea* in the same verse) ; Jer. li. 13 (for the Euphrates), etc., and several times in revelation. Our friends are anxious to make out that John chose a place where there was "much water," for the sake of the general comfort of the people and the wants of their animals. The Saviour, however, was more popular than John, and to say the least, as philanthropic and compassionate as His messenger ; yet we do not read that He chose, as His preaching stations, places in which there was much water ! Does not this consideration show the futility of the objection ?

PAUL RISING TO BE BAPTIZED.

Prof. Godwin speaks thus of Paul's baptism : "It was either performed while the person stood up or it so quickly followed his rising from a couch, that it might be said, He, rising up, was baptized. Dipping under such circumstances is highly improbable, even if there were a bath in the house ; and much more if there were not." "Paul was baptized before he left his sick chamber, even before he took food, after a season of much distress" ("Christian Baptism," pp. 113, 268). Such reasoning is much more plausible than sound. The expression, "he arose and was baptized," ἀναστὰς ἐβαπτίσθη *having arisen, he was baptised* (Acts ix. 18 ; xxii. 16), does not necessarily imply that Paul was, previously to his baptism, lying ill on a couch, nor either that he was baptized in the room. The participle *anastas* (having arisen) is often employed *pleonastically* in the New Testament, when there was no need of it to express the meaning, and when there was no illness in the case. (See Matt. ix. 9. Mark

vii. 24 ; x. 1. Luke i. 39 ; xv. 18, 20 ; xxiii. 1. Acts viii. 27 ; ix. 11.) At other times it is used in elliptical phrases, like that in Luke iv. 38, "*And he arose out of the synagogue,*" which Dr. Robinson renders, "*And he arose and went out of the synagogue.*" Thus also, Mark iii. 3, "*Arise into the middle,*" means "*Arise and come into the middle.*" Compare Exod. viii. 20. So in regard to Saul's baptism ; the meaning may be as, Dr. Hackett puts it, "*Having arisen,*" and (if need be) gone forth to the place of his baptism. Comp. Luke iv. 38 ; or simply *having made himself ready* ; that is, without delay. Comp. Luke xv. 18. It is impossible to infer from it (adds Dr. Hackett) that he was baptized in the house of Judas, or that he was not. Damascus at the present day abounds in water, and all the better houses have a reservoir in their court, or stand beside a natural or an artificial stream." (Hackett on the Acts.) Nor would his being immersed prove detrimental to Saul's condition. After a season of overwhelming excitement and anxiety, with the entrance of God's joy and peace into his heart, immersion in water in the city of Damascus might be most conducive to his natural health ; and, for aught the narrative says, such was the case.

CHAPTER XIII.

BAPTISM AND PURIFICATION.

DR. EDWARD BEECHER maintained "that baptizo, as a religious term, means neither to dip nor sprinkle, immerse nor pour, but to purify or cleanse, without reference to the mode." Professor J. H. Godwin advocates a similar theory in his "Christian Baptism," and Dr. Henderson warmly approved of it. Dr. Henderson asserts in his "Baptism and the Bible Society," p. 9, that Dr. Beecher has demonstrated that in the New Testament *baptism* and *purification* are perfectly synonymous terms. But Dr. Henderson, moreover, in the same pamphlet seeks to prove that baptizo is equivalent to a Syriac word, which means according to him, to stand up! But it cannot mean *to purify* and *to stand up*; consistency requires that one or the other should be given up; truth demands the rejection of both as the meaning of *baptizo*.

There are several considerations that show the weakness and absurdity of the notion that baptism and purification are synonymous terms:—

1. It is perfectly arbitrary to ascribe this meaning to the word baptizo when used as a religious term.

No one has a right to explain away the literal meaning of a word and substitute a figurative or secondary meaning, in order to support his own view of a passage, if the literal rendering does not show what is said to take place to be either absurd or impossible. When a word must be explained figuratively, the figurative explanation should be in harmony with the literal meaning: for example, the figurative use of baptizo in Luke xii. 50, must be explained in harmony with its literal use in Matt. iii. 6, 16, the former to denote

immersion, as it were, in a deluge of sufferings, as the latter was a literal immersion in the river Jordan.

2. The word for *to purify* is a different word from that used for the act of baptism; and the natural inference is that the words are not synonymous.

Katharizo is the verb used for to purify, whereas *baptizo* is used to denote the act of baptism. *Baptizo* may be used by Greek writers to denote immersion *for the sake of* purification, and as *the means of* attaining it; but in such a case purification is the effect or the result of the act of immersion, just as to receive wages is the result of previous labour, or to be well informed is the result of previous extensive reading. The classical meaning of the verb—*to immerse*—suits every case in which the word occurs in the New Testament, and by this, therefore, we ought to abide.

In Lev. xiv., 6—9, there are several words used in connection with the rites of cleansing the leper; the concluding act being the immersion of the whole body in water and the result the leper's being declared clean.

3. The New Testament does not represent baptism as purification, though it may, by implication, include the idea of cleansing. Purification must have reference to either *ceremonial* or *moral* defilement; Christianity does not recognize the former, and the heart is purified by faith and through the blood of Christ (Acts xv. 9; 1 John i. 7). Peter says that baptism is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh" (1 Pet. iii. 21), and Paul teaches that the blood of Christ only purgeth the conscience (Heb. ix. 14).

The passage in Acts xxii. 16, "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins"—has reference to the symbolical signification of baptism, which sets forth the believer as dead and buried, as regards the former life; but risen and quickened, as regards God and His service; and thus, so to speak, his connection with his sins is broken off, and they are, as it were, washed away. But this explanation of the passage does not by any means do away with the literal meaning of the word *baptizo*; on the other hand it requires it to render the words intelligible. "In baptism (says Dr. Chase) there is retained in all its significance the idea of cleansing or purification. For the water in which we are buried is a purifying element. Thus there is a figurative washing away of sins, a putting off of the

body of sinful propensities, and, as it were, a depositing of it in the grave, from which, in this emblem, we come forth as alive from the dead, to "walk in newness of life," and at length to enter on the life everlasting, "as Christ was raised up from the dead," after His having voluntarily endured those sufferings by which, we humbly trust, we have been delivered from eternal death. ("The Design of Baptism," &c., by I. Chase, D.D., p. 21.)

Dr. Beecher paraphrases Acts xxii. 16, thus : "*Baptisai*, purify thyself, or be purified bodily,—*apolousai tas hamartias*, wash away thy sins, as to the mind, by calling on the name of the Lord." This language,—to "be purified bodily," is at variance with the declaration of Peter, that baptism is not the purification of the flesh (1 Pet. iii. 21), and it almost assumes that Christianity recognizes ceremonial defilement ! This would be a return to Judaism !

4. The opinion that baptism and purification are synonymous terms tends to render Scripture obscure and unintelligible.

(1.) Christ is said to have been baptized. Surely He was not purified by John !

(2.) Baptism sets forth burial and resurrection. How could a man be buried with Christ by means of purification ? Rom. vi. 4.

(3.) Baptism is compared to the deluge. How could purification without reference to mode be compared to the flood ?

(4.) If baptizo means to purify, the words of Scripture are meaningless. "Be purified, and wash away the sins," sounds like tautology, and such a direction would be misleading and embarrassing to a soul in distress.

To seek to force Malachi iii. 1—3 into his service, as corroborating the correctness of his view, was a bold attempt of Dr. Beecher's ; but it does not prove his theory of baptism, any more than did Cyprian's quotation of Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, prove the validity of sprinkling. The words of Malachi do not refer to the ordinance of baptism ; but to Christ's heart-searching ministry and doctrine, which subjected His followers to the severest test, and caused many of them to forsake Him (John vi. 60, 66), whilst the same truths attached others for ever unto Him (John vi. 67, 68).

(5.) There is no evidence that either Jews or Christians understood *baptizo* to mean *to purify*.

The Apostles in comparing baptism to a burial and resurrection evidently understood it to denote immersion. We have seen how the early Church understood the command of the Lord. The compilers of the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, written probably in the third or the fourth century, knew nothing of the purifying theory when they wrote the following :—"The water is instead of (represents) the burial; the descent (*he kataudusis*) into the water, the dying together with Christ; the ascent (*he anadusis*) out of the water, the rising together with Him" (Book III. ch. 17). We find, on the contrary, Jews and Christians, using *baptizo* when the result is the reverse of to purify. In Isaiah xxi. 4, we have for the words "fearfulness affrighted me," the following phrase in the LXX :—" *He anomia me baptizei,*" "iniquity plunges me," that is, into distress: or according to the theory under consideration, if carried to its legitimate conclusions,—" *Sin purifies me!*" Clement of Alexandria and Chrysostom use the verb *baptizo* in such connections as these :—"To be plunged (*baptizomenos*) by drunkenness into sleep;" "to be plunged (*baptisthenai*) deeply by drunkenness;" "to be sunk (*ei-baptismenoi*) in wickedness;" and "to plunge (*baptizousi*) from soberness into fornication."

The fact is, as the reader must feel convinced, that the word means to *dip, plunge, immerse*, either literally or figuratively, whatever may be the element in which, or the end for which, the act takes place; and that it does not necessarily denote to *purify* any more than to *pollute*.

If John iii. 25 refer to the baptism of John, it must refer to it as the means of purification, and to the comparative efficacy of John's baptism and of Jewish ablutions, and the passage in no way affects the meaning of the word employed to denote the ordinance of Christ.

Nor does Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25 prove that *baptizo* means to *purify* :—"He that immerseth himself (*baptizomenos*) from a dead body, and toucheth it again, what is he profited by his bathing (*to loutro*)?" The words, after filling up the ellipsis, read as follows :—"He that immerseth himself in order to be purified from the pollution contracted by contact with a dead body, and polluteth himself by touching it again, of what use is his plunging himself into the water to him?" (See B. W. Noel's "External Act of Baptism," pp. 49, 53; Dr. Carson's "Reply to Beecher.")

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SYRIAC WORD FOR BAPTISM.

THE New Testament was early translated into the Syriac. It is said that the Peshito-Syriac version—so called from its being *literal*—was made as early as the beginning of the second century. Philoxenus, Bishop of Hierapolis, brought out another version about the beginning of the sixth century, called the Philoxenian version. It is affirmed by some Pædo-Baptist scholars that the language of the Peshito differs but little, if any, from the language in which Christ and His Apostles conversed and preached, and that it is extremely probable that Christ, in commanding His Apostles to baptize, used the identical term to denote the act which is found in the Syriac New Testament. The word under consideration is AMAD, which, it is asserted, belongs to the same root as, and is equivalent to, the Hebrew מַעַד (*amad*), and that it means *to stand, to arise*, etc., and that βαπτίζω (*baptizo*) is but a translation of this Syriac *amad*, which means *to stand up*. Dr. Murdock (in *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1850) explains it to denote one *taking his stand* for Christianity, without alluding to the mode; and Moses Stuart ("Essay on Baptism," sec. 8) and Professor Lee ("Hebrew Lexicon," under מַעַד) understand it as meaning simply the *rite of confirmation*, "because *confirmation* is given with baptism in the Eastern Churches" as if this rite had existed from apostolic times! Dr. Bennett, after noticing that the Syriac word for baptism is *amad*, and asserting that the word translated "pillars" in Gal. ii. 9, is a derivative of the same, states the case as follows:—

"The standing ceremony, then, which is the direct

opposite of the dipping ceremony, is the phrase employed by the mother of all churches forbidding us to suppose that when it was translated in the New Testament by *baptizo*, the idea of immersion was intended. It may indeed be doubted whether any reference to the ritual *mode* was designed to be conveyed by the Syriac, for the moral idea of a man taking his standing, or his station, in the Christian Church, may be the meaning; but if the mode be insisted upon, then the idea conveyed by the word is that of a man standing upright, like a pillar, to have water poured upon him." ("Theology of the Early Church," edition 1855, page 201.)

Dr. Henderson also writes to the same effect. Were this theory correct, it would be difficult to see how our brethren could cause their infants to undergo this "*standing ceremony*," and in what manner the little ones could "take their standing" in the Christian Church. But such a theory involves two or three unwarrantable assumptions:—

1. That it was Syriac that Christ and His Apostles spoke. After their return from the Babylonish captivity, the Jews spoke a kind of corrupt Hebrew, or a Chaldee dialect, called *Aramæan*, and, in Christian literature, *Syriac*. That Christ used many Aramæan words is evident from the Gospels, but whether He and His disciples conversed or preached in Aramæan is another question. Though the probability of this is conceded by Dr. Gotch, and affirmed by Professor Hackett (preface to Winer's Chaldee Grammar), yet much may be said for the opinion that He conversed and preached in Hellenistic Greek. Greek was as well known in Galilee as Aramæan, and it was the vernacular language of many countries in Europe and Asia, and had long been so amongst the Jews in Egypt, which fact had called the Septuagint into existence. "In the times of the Apostles—(says Bishop M'Ilvaine, in his "Evidences of Christianity," page 76)—Greek was almost a universal language. It was spread over all Palestine. The Jewish coast, on the Mediterranean, was occupied by cities either wholly or half Greek. On the eastern border of the land, from the Arnon upwards, towards the north, the cities were Greek, and towards the south, in possession of the Greeks. Several cities of Judea and Galilee were either entirely, or, at least, half-peopled by Greeks." Dr. E. Robinson also speaks to the same effect:—"Meanwhile, the Greek language had become cur-

rent also in Palestine, along with the Aramæan—partly through frequent intercourse with Hellenistic Jews settled in Egypt and in Asia Minor, who constantly resorted to Jerusalem, and partly through the influence of the Herods and the Roman dominion. Hence the New Testament was written in the now universal tongue.” (Preface to “Greek Lexicon,” edition 1850, page 6.) See also Kitto’s “Cyclopædia,” article “Hellenist.” It is quite as possible, therefore, that Christ made use of the Greek word *baptizo* in the commission, as that He used the Syriac *amad*.

2. It is assumed that *baptizo* is a translation of the Syriac word. It is too soon to speak of a translation till it be proved that it was in Syriac that Christ gave the commission.

3. That the Syriac *amad* was derived from the Hebrew *amad*—*to stand*, and that, therefore, it means the same thing. But this is the point in dispute. It seems, according to Michaelis, Dr. Gotch, and Dr. B. Davies, that no instance of the Syriac verb *amad* denoting *to stand*, has yet been found; but it is altogether probable that there was once a root *amad* in Syriac meaning *to stand*, of which the word translated *pillar*, or *pillars*, in 1 Tim. iii. 15, Gal. ii. 9, Rev. iii. 12, x. 1, is a derivative. The late learned Dr. Benj. Davies thought that he had found instances of an *amad* in Hebrew for *to sink* or *dip*, which verb is said by most scholars to be obsolete in Hebrew in this sense, though found in the cognate dialects. See Davies’s Heb. Lexicon, עמד II.

Michaelis, in his edition of Castell’s Syriac Lexicon, makes the following remark on the relation of the Syriac *amad* to the Hebrew *amad*:—“In this signification of baptizing, not a few compare (the word) with the Hebrew AMAD, *he stood*; so that *to stand* may be *to stand in the river*, and in it *to be immersed*. To me it seems more probable, that it is plainly different from עמד (*amad*), and that by some change of letters it originated from (the Arabic) *ghamata*=*to submerge, to immerse*.” According to the renowned scholar Michaelis, then, the assumption of our friends is groundless.

Even were it true that the Hebrew verb for *to stand*, and the Syriac verb for *to baptize*, have the same root, it would not follow that they have the same meaning. “It is by no means uncommon that the same root in different dialects, or in the different conjugations of the same dialect, should

express directly opposite ideas. Compare אָבַח (*abah*) in Hebrew, *to be willing*; in Arabic, *to be unwilling*. Arabic, *habba—to love*, construed with *Be—not to love*; Arab, *chaba—to be extinguished*, and *to be kindled*. חָטָא (*chata*) to *sin*: חָטָא (*chitte*), the same verb in the Piel conjugation, *to expiate sin*. Arabic, *qashata*, fut. A. and O. *to be righteous, equitable, to give just measure*; and fut. I., *to be unjust, to take advantage of, to deceive*, which in Ethiop. is the common and only meaning. שָׁרֵשׁ (*sheresh*) *to root up*; הִשְׁרִישׁ (*hishrish*—the same verb in a different conjugation), *to take root*.”—Gesenius’s Hebrew Lexicon by Gibbs, Note under נָכַר (*nachar*), which verb itself means *to despise* and *to honour, to deny* and *to acknowledge*. So that even if the premises of our opponents were granted, it would not follow that their conclusions are admissible; and the Syriac *amad* might, after all, signify *to immerse*, and never *to stand up*.

4. According to the hypothesis of our friends, *baptizo* means *to stand*. If not, what is it that they aim at by alluding to the Syriac? If their theory be correct *baptizo* must mean *to stand*, or else the evangelists gave us a wrong translation. It would be an interesting discovery to find instances of such meaning. One might think that *anistemi* would have answered their purpose much better than *baptizo*, if the case be as our friends represent it. But it is unspeakably more probable that the theory of our friends is false than that the inspired writers made such a glaring mistake. Such a theory is inconsistent with a belief in the absolute authority and infallibility of the Divine oracles.

I shall now, very briefly, give a summary of the evidence that the Syriac verb *amad* denotes *to immerse*.

I.—THE TESTIMONY OF SYRIAC LEXICONS.

Their testimony, which is in Latin, is substantially as follows:—

CASTELL’S:—“*Amad*,—he was washed, he was baptized. *Aphel*, he immersed, he baptized.”

BUXTORF’S:—“*Amad*,—to be baptized, to be immersed, to be washed, to bathe. *Ethp.* The same meaning. *Aphel*, to baptize.”

SCHAAF'S:—" *Amad*,—he bathed, washed, dipped, plunged into water, he was baptized. *Aphel*, he immersed (Num. xxxi. 23), baptized."

BERNSTEIN'S:—" *Amad*, (1) he was dipped, immersed; he dipped, or plunged himself into something. 'It plunges itself (*amad*) into the depth of the sea.' 'The point of the arrow sank into his brain.' *Figuratively*, the day dipped itself, *i. e.*, it waned, it disappeared.' (2) To be bathed, washed, by immersion in water. (3) He was initiated by means of the sacred bath, he was baptized. *Aphel*, (Greek, *baptain*, *baptizein*) (1) he dipped, immersed; (2) bathed, washed; (3) baptized." (See his *Lexicon Syriacum* to Kirsch's *Syriac Chrestomathy*, and the references under the word.)

Guthrie, in the small "Syriac Lexicon" edited by Dr. Henderson, gives as the meaning of *amad*, "*he baptized, he was baptized; also, he sustained.*" But as he only gives the Latin form of the Greek word for baptism, it does not appear what he understands by the Syriac word. As to the other meaning he ascribes to *amad*, *i. e.*, *he sustained* (*sustentavit*), Dr. Gotch remarks that no reference is made to support that meaning, and that it is apparently introduced simply for the purpose of deducing from the verb the noun *amad*—*columna*. With this exception the authority of the Lexicons referred to is altogether against any such meaning as "to stand." Schaaf compares the word with the Hebrew *amad*, *stetit* (he stood) and the Arabic *amada*, but does not give the slightest hint that any of these meanings are extant in the Syriac verb" (Dr. Gotch's "Critical Examination," etc., p. 11). What Dr. Gotch affirms of the Lexicons of Castell, Buxtorf, and Schaaf, is also true of Bernstein's Lexicon, as is seen above.

II. THE USE MADE OF THE SYRIAC VERB FOR THE ACT OF BAPTISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Dr. Gotch, in his very learned and valuable "Examination," gives in substance the following results:—"That the Syriac verb *amad* and its derivatives are employed for the Greek verb *baptizo* and its derivatives in 120 instances; and the noun *maaduthito* (which signifies both *baptism* and *baptistery*) is used four times for *kolumbethra*—a swimming

pool (John v. 2, 4, 7, and ix. 7), and twice for *photisthentes* — *having been enlightened* (Heb. vi. 4, x. 32)."

It must be evident to the reader from the above summary of results, that the Syriac verb *amad* meant, in the estimation of the translator, or translators, of the Syriac New Testament, something very different from *standing up*. The noun derived from it could not have denoted a bathing-place or a swimming-pool, unless the verb conveyed the idea of *bathing* or *immersion*. The verb is used in Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, for the *taking of a bath*, and the noun also in the former passage for the *immersion* of vessels and different utensils.

The same verb is used in Luke xii. 50, Mark x. 38, 39, and Matt. xx. 22, where the sufferings of Christ are spoken of, and the idea of *sinking* in a flood of afflictions, or of *being overwhelmed with them*, is expressed.

Those of our readers who remember the description of baptism by Justin Martyr, quoted in one of the preceding chapters, will not be surprised at such a rendering as that of Heb. vi. 4 in the Syriac version: "Those who once went down to baptism" for "Those who were once enlightened." Infant baptism being unknown in the first and second centuries, the early Christians called baptism *illumination*, because the candidates were supposed to be enlightened in their minds by the word and grace of God (Apologia, I. sec. 61):

III. INSTANCES OF THE SYRIAC WORD FOR BAPTISM IN OTHER WRITINGS THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Numbers xxxi. 23: "All that abideth not the fire, ye shall plunge it (Syriac, *amad*) in water." It is also used in the Apocrypha in Judith xii. 7, and in Susanna xiii. 15, for *to bathe* or *immerse one's self*, for which the LXX has *baptizo* and *louo* in the middle voice.

Dr. Gotch adduces instances from Christian writers of the use of the verb for immersion. Ephraim Syrus, who flourished in the fourth century, speaks of Christ as having been baptized (*amad*) in the river. "How wonderful is it (he says in another place) that Thy footsteps were planted on the waters; that the great sea should subject itself to Thy feet; and that yet at a small river that same head of Thine should be subjected *to be bowed down and baptized (amad) in it!*" As the waters of the sea were placed under the feet of

Christ, so His head was placed under the flood of the Jordan.

In the "Nestorian Ritual," compiled about A.D. 650, the priest is represented as taking the child and *dipping* (Syr. *tebac*) him in the water, and saying, "*such an one is baptized* (Syr., *omed*) in the name of the Father, etc., and then *causing him to ascend from the water*." In this ritual, the verb *amad* is used interchangeably with *tebac*, which has no other meaning but to *immerse*. In the Syriac Chrestomathy, to which Bernstein's Lexicon is attached, p. 209, the verb is used by Bar-Hebræus of the leviathan of Job xli. 1, *plunging* (*omed*) in the depth of the sea. The same verb is used in the same sense in Book I, sect. 17, of the Theophania of Eusebius, written about A.D. 411, and translated thus by the late Professor Lee, of Cambridge: "This self-same Word of God also *immersed* (*amad*) even into the depths of the sea, and determined those swimming natures," etc. Surely the "standing ceremony" of our friends would not suit these passages.

I find the following instance also of the word *amad* in a volume of translations from the Syriac by the Rev. Dr. Burgess. Ephraim Syrus, speaking of the deluge, says:—

"The history is familiar to us
Of the inundation in the days of Noah;
When, by the breaking forth of justice,
The whole human race was drowned (*amad*)."

The translation is Dr. Burgess's. The idea of immersion is necessarily involved in the passage; they were drowned in consequence of being overwhelmed and buried in the waters. (See Ephraim Syrus's "Repentance of Nineveh," by Dr. Burgess, pp. 36, 37.)

The late Rev. Dr. Davies, of Regent's Park College, in an elaborate article on this question in the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for July, 1851, pp. 554—563 (reprinted in London in 1852), quotes the testimonies of native Syrian lexicographers. One is from a Syro-Arabic Lexicon, by Bar-Ali, who flourished about A.D. 885, which is rendered into English by Dr. Davies as follows:—" *Amad* (in different forms): (1) An immersing, a bathing, a dipping. (2) He was immersed, he was baptized. (3) Baptism or immersion. (4) Pillar, column, pillar of light. (5) He who dives or bathes." The

testimony of another lexicon by Bar-Bahlul, who flourished in the tenth century, is also given, and is substantially the same.

IV. BAPTISM AMONG THE SYRIANS AND NESTORIANS.

The Syrian sect called *Zabæans*, or *Mendæans*, or Disciples of St. John, baptizes by immersion. The name *Zabæans* is derived, according to Neander, from the Syriac verb *tsebæ*, to *immerse*, and they are so called from their manner of baptizing. Dr. Wall says that all the Christians of Asia and Africa, and one-third of those of Europe, baptize by immersion ("Hist. of Inf. Baptism," vol. ii. p. 414; Robinson's "Hist. of Baptism," pp. 117—124).

The present mode of baptizing among the Nestorians is a proof that the Syriac *amad* means to *immerse*. Let it be borne in mind that it is the Syriac language which they speak. "The language of the Nestorians," says Dr. Perkins, an eminent American missionary amongst them, "a modern dialect of the Syriac, is derived as directly from that venerable tongue, as the modern Greek from the ancient" (Journal of the S. L., 1853, p. 382). The Revs. G. P. Badger, in his "Nestorians and their Ritual," Thos. Laurie, in his "Life of Dr. Grant," and Smith and Dwight, in their "Missionary Researches," speak of their language as Syriac. When two of their teachers visited London in 1862, it was by means of the Syriac that they were able to hold intercourse with Englishmen, the Rev. B. H. Cowper acting as interpreter. It is the Syriac Scriptures that they use. Dr. Grant distributed the Scriptures amongst them in the ancient Syriac as well as in the Syro-Chaldaic, or Syriac in Nestorian characters. But they baptize by immersion, and employ the Syriac *amad* to denote the act, their ritual being the same in this respect as the one already referred to (Badger's "Nestorians," vol. ii. pp. 207, 208, ed. 1852; Smith and Dwight's "Missionary Researches in Armenia," p. 382). Could this have been the case, if *amad* meant to *stand up*?

V. THE IDEA OF STANDING UP IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

Paul looks on baptism as an emblem of burial and resurrection; Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12. But how could the Christians be buried by means of baptism, and raised again, if

Christ used a word for the ordinance which meant to *stand up*, or *stand upright like a pillar*? If it meant this, how could the descent of Israel into the Red Sea, and their being buried out of sight in the cloud and in the sea, and their emerging on the other side, be compared to baptism? How could the noun ever have been used for a swimming-pool, if it means one taking his stand, or standing erect? Would the Syrian translator on that supposition have rendered Heb. vi. 4, "Who *have once descended* to baptism," if the Syriac word for baptism mean "a standing erect"? The inconsistencies and absurdities of the "standing ceremony" theory are a sufficient refutation of it. It has been said that if the translators of the Syriac New Testament, and the Syrian Christians in general, desired to convey the idea of immersion by the term used for the act of baptism, they would have employed *tsebae* instead of *amal*; but as Augusti and Dr. B. Davies suggest, the reason why they chose *amal* may possibly have been that *tsebae* had been already appropriated by the Zabæans or Hemerobaptists, a half-Jewish sect, supposed to have come down from John the Baptist. The Syrian Christians would naturally wish not to be confounded with a religious sect with which they had no communion, and hence might have adopted another equally appropriate term to denote the baptismal act.

After all, the Syriac translation is not our rule. Whatever it may teach, it is not our infallible guide, and its renderings are not binding upon us. The inspired writings of the prophets, and the apostles, and the other holy writers in the original tongues, are our ultimate standard of appeal and highest authority, and not translations, however excellent and venerable. The word used in the Greek Testament for the act of baptism is *baptizo*; and this, we venture to hope, has been shown in the preceding chapters to denote to *immerse* or *cause to be immersed*, either in a literal or figurative sense, and that only. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess. v. 21).

Those who wish to inquire further into this subject are recommended to consult the excellent work of Dr. Gotch, already referred to; Dr. Davies's learned article on Syriac Philology, also alluded to; Dr. Toy's somewhat brief but able and comprehensive article in the *American Baptist Quarterly*, for 1872; and "The Baptists and the Bible Society," being

the memorial relating to the versions of Baptist missionaries presented to the committee of the Bible Society, in 1840.

Trusting that these brief chapters on the Act of Baptism, written amidst manifold cares, may have been, and may still be of some help to inquirers after the truth, I now bring them to a close, with my earnest prayer that the Lord may bless the perusal of them to promote, in some measure, "the obedience of faith " in our beloved land. AMEN.

INDEX.

	PAGE
ABLUTIONS, Jewish.....	24-29
Heathen.....	66-67
AMAD, The Syriac verb.....	75-84
BAPTISM, of John	4-6
in the apostolic age.....	30-36
in the Early Church	37-41
in the Greek and Eastern Churches	50-55
Corruption of.....	40-45
Signification of.....	8, 10, 33-36
BAPTISTERIES	47-49
BAPTIZO, The lexicons on.....	10, 11
in the classics	18-21
in Jewish and Christian writings	20, 21, 27-36
construed with <i>en</i> and <i>eis</i>	35, 60, 61
BAPTO, The lexicons on	12
in the classics	13
in the LXX and New Testament	13, 14
construed with <i>apo</i>	14-17
BEECHER, Dr. E., Theory of	71-74
BENNETT, Dr., quoted	75, 76
CISTERNS, in Jerusalem	31
CYPRIAN, on sprinkling	44
Dew, in the East	16
GODWIN, Professor J. H., referred to	22, 28, 29, 62, 69, 71
GREEK PREPOSITIONS	60-62
HALLEY, the late Rev. Dr., Objections by	56-70
HEBRAISM	69
HEBREW, Different meanings of the same words in	78
idiom affecting the Greek.....	14-16

	PAGE
IMMERSEION, public	64
trine	40, 41
JERUSALEM, Water supply of	31
JUDITH, immersing herself	27-29
LUSTRATIONS, Heathen	66-68
LYNCH, Lieut., on bathing in the Jordan	64
NEBUCHADNEZZAR, immersed in the dew.....	15, 16
NOVATIAN, perfused	43
PAUL'S BAPTISM	69
POOLS OF JERUSALEM	31
PROSELYTE BAPTISM	2-6
PURIFICATION	71-74
SPRINKLING, Rise of	42-45
SYRIAC, Word for "baptism" in	75-84
WOMEN, Modesty of Eastern	63, 64
Words retaining their literal meaning in the Bible	9, 10

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

FEB 1 '60

APR 1 '60

MAY 1 '60

AP 15 '61

MAY 10 1967

OCT 30 1990

JAN 3 '00

265.1

J77

Jones, Hugh

AUTHOR

The act of baptism.

TITLE

265.1

J77

Jones, Hugh

The act of baptism.

29240

